

Sturtevant, of Middleton, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY: Resolution of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, favoring appropriation of ample funds to guarantee the protection of the live-stock industry of the country against the present outbreak and any future outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Richard M. Hurd, of New York City, in favor of bill to regulate interstate commerce between States in prison-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of M. D. Helfrich, of Evansville, Ind., in favor of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Resolutions of Norwich (Conn.) Camp, No. 75, Sons of Zion, against the passage of the so-called Smith bill (S. 2543), restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of Flood Commission of Pittsburgh, Pa., and of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of Newlands river bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of river improvements and flood prevention; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Beaver County, Pa., opposed to legislation to restrict exports to European countries at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, in favor of S. 6688; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Springfield (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 302, International Order of Good Templars, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of New York City, for suppression of defamatory publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of S. M. Power, of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of S. 6688; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of the Nord Oestliche Saengerbund of America and T. L. Gilmore, president of the National Model License League, of Louisville, Ky., against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of the executive committee of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, urging upon Congress the appropriation of ample funds to guarantee the protection of the live-stock industry of the country against the present outbreak and any future outbreaks of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Mount Shasta Lodge, No. 312, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of Dunsmuir, Cal., in favor of H. R. 17894; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Knights and Ladies of Oakland Council, No. 733; of the Le Tres Joli Club; Live Oak Lodge, No. 17; of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division No. 2; of the Fruitvale Aerie, No. 1375, Fraternal Order of Eagles; of the Estrella da Massha Council, No. 84, I. D. E. S.; of the Jefferson School Mothers' Club; of the Oakland Lodge, No. 324, Loyal Order of Moose; and of the Argonaut Tent, No. 33, of the Maccabees, all of Oakland, Cal.; of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Cal.; of the Chamber of Commerce of Truckee, Cal.; of the Grass Valley Chamber of Commerce; of the Honey Lake Development League, of Jamesville, Cal.; of the Wetonka Tribe, No. 208, Improved Order of Red Men, of Los Gatos, Cal.; of the San Jose Camp, No. 7777, Modern Woodmen of America; of the Fruitvale Lodge, No. 56, Knights of Pythias; of the Dirigo Lodge, No. 224, Knights of Pythias; and of the Ouray Tribe of Improved Order of Red Men, of San Jose, Cal., in favor of H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Wichita Falls, Tex., protesting against making gas lines common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Rev. H. Reinemund and 19 others, supporting House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Kampen Lodge, No. 15, International Order of Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of residents of Bay City, Mich., for suppression of defamatory publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William H. Ramalia and 18 others, in favor of farm finance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 30, 1914.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 29, 1914.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). When the Senate took a recess it had under consideration House bill 6060, known as the immigration bill, and the Senate resumes its consideration.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and residence of aliens in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Hardwick	Overman	Smoot
Brandegge	Hitchcock	Page	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Perkins	Thomas
Burton	Kern	Pomerene	Thornton
Chamberlain	La Follette	Ransdell	Townsend
Clapp	Lane	Reed	Vardaman
Culberson	Lodge	Robinson	White
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Goff	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. THORNTON. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY]. This announcement will stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], who is absent, is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for all roll calls to-day.

Mr. LODGE. My colleague [Mr. WEEKS] is absent from the city. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. LEA of Tennessee and Mr. WALSH answered to their names when called.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], on account of illness in his family. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. REED. My colleague [Mr. STONE] is detained from the Senate and from the city on account of indisposition in his family. I make this announcement generally for the day and to cover the past day.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. SUTHERLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] from the city. He is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. WORKS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

[Mr. REED addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, since I favor this bill with the literacy test included, I find myself unable to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. The bill itself contains this language:

That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they emigrated from the country of which they were last permanent residents solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution.

For that language the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] proposes to substitute the following:

That the following classes of persons, when otherwise qualified for admission under the laws of the United States, shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious, political, or racial persecution, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by discriminatory laws or regulations.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado not only broadens the classes by including two classes that are not at all included in the language of the bill as reported by the committee, but also weakens very much the provisions of the exemption suggested by the committee. The language proposed by the committee is in the case of religious persecution that this test shall not apply when these aliens can "prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or the Secretary of Labor that they emigrated from the country of which they were last permanent residents solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution."

On the other hand, the language of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is much weaker than that, and merely provides that the immigrants shall be exempted from this literacy test when they are seeking admission into the United States to avoid "religious, political, or racial persecution." Then the provision is still further weakened and the floodgates opened still wider by the concluding language of the Senator's amendment:

Whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by discriminatory laws or regulations.

When this great war shall have been concluded and the nations of the earth readjust themselves again to the conditions that may then exist it will doubtless be possible for almost every immigrant who seeks admission to our shores to claim with some degree of plausibility that he is endeavoring to escape, in part at least, political or racial persecution. I think I voice the sentiment not only of the chairman of the committee, but all the other members of the committee, when I say it seems to us that to so broaden the exception would be virtually to emasculate and destroy the literacy test, and that if this test is to perform the great function we think it will perform and that it is designed to perform it must be left without this amendment, for with this amendment it would be virtually destroyed, and almost every immigrant could escape or evade its provisions.

Mr. President, we have listened to some very eloquent speeches on this subject based largely, if not entirely, on sentiment. Senators have approached this discussion with all the great eloquence of which they are capable, it seems to me, entirely from a sentimental standpoint and not from the standpoint that ought to be their first and foremost consideration, that ought to operate on each one of our minds and control the conduct and vote of each one of us on this question. It seems to me that the first and paramount duty of each Senator on this floor is to consider above all other questions our own country, our own people, and what the effect of this legislation will be upon their well-being and upon the prosperity and happiness and future welfare of our own country.

We are not running, Mr. President, an eleemosynary institution, taking in everybody that we might be sorry for, regardless of what the effect is upon our own body politic. We are obliged to consider as American citizens first and foremost of all the interests of our own people and the future well-being of our own country in making laws. It seems to me the subject ought to be approached from that standpoint and not from the standpoint of sentimentality, of some hardship that might be worked in an individual case or in a few individual cases or even in many individual cases. The general good of our own people ought to be the primary consideration that controls each vote on this floor when this great question shall come to the test of a vote.

There are certain propositions connected with this matter which, from that standpoint, even the most eloquent Senators who have opposed this literacy test and who have favored the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado can hardly deny. First and foremost of all, I contend that the immigrant who does not come to this country with the desire and intention of remaining here and becoming a part and parcel of this country is not a desirable immigrant. I do not believe that the Senator who last addressed the Senate, my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], or the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who spoke here so eloquently yesterday on this question, would controvert that proposition, no matter how liberal their views are on the subject of admitting immigrants at our ports.

The men who come here with no desire of becoming American citizens, with no intention to do so, but simply with the desire and purpose of reaping whatever industrial reward they can from more favorable industrial conditions in this country and from better wages in this country over and above what they could get in their own countries, simply come and strip our country bare, as far as they can do it, and to carry back in triumph to some foreign shore the spoils of their temporary sojourn here. They do not raise the standards of American life or the standards of American politics, the standards of American living or the standards of American wages; they do not even maintain those standards in every case. The general rule is that they lower every one of those standards.

For one I am utterly opposed to any system of laws which will permit any general immigration into this country of men who do not come here with a desire and purpose of becoming a part of this country, of becoming American citizens, and of staying with us permanently; and there are none of the arguments which have been presented by the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] or by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] which could be or would be employed by either one of those distinguished gentlemen in behalf of such immigrants. None of the eloquent illustrations of these Senators, none of the splendid individual cases to which they referred, were of men who came to this country but to exploit and then return to their own countries—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. REED. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I stated the same position which the Senator takes on that.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought so.

Mr. REED. That such immigration was undesirable; but I also call his attention to the fact that this committee has not even tried to reach that in this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I shall endeavor in another part of this argument to answer that comment of the Senator. I am glad to know that he is in sympathy with my views on that branch of this question; in fact, I do not see how any Senator could possibly differ from me if he were a real American and had the real interests of the American people at heart, as I know every Senator has.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish in this connection, because those who are interested and would like to follow the debate in the RECORD will get the facts perhaps better to have them in juxtaposition, to make a suggestion. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] says there has been no effort on the part of the committee to stop these birds of passage to whom the Senator from Georgia is alluding. From its first page to practically the last the bill is devoted to restrictions on steamship companies and restrictions which are thrown around the importation of contract labor, and numerous other restrictions that it is needless for me to mention, but which a casual reading of the bill will disclose.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Georgia will pardon me, those are general restrictions applying to all immigration. There is not to be found in this bill any provision which undertakes to set up any test by which it can be determined that the man coming here intends to remain. It may be that that is impossible to do, but nevertheless it is true that it is not in the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, with all deference to the Senator's view, I quite agree with my friend from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. It is in every line of this bill, in every provision of this bill, in every respect in which we strengthen the

immigration laws, in every respect in which we impose more rigid tests, in every respect in which we increase the head tax, in every respect in which we prohibit contract labor or the solicitation of labor abroad by contract-labor agencies—in all of these respects and in every respect this entire bill is designed to accomplish that primary purpose. There is necessity for it, too, Mr. President—real necessity.

The strike at Lawrence, Mass., has been several times adverted to during this discussion by Senators who have participated in this debate. It happened to be my fortune to conduct, in part at least, the investigation of that strike while in the other branch of Congress. I devoted a good deal of time to the examination of the witnesses. A most remarkable condition was disclosed in that investigation, which ought not to be lost sight of in this body nor by the American people. Those people at Lawrence, regardless of what Senators may think of the controversy between them and their employers, universally represented that they had been induced to come to this country—they swore it—by flaming posters, picturing the American laboring man clad in glad raiment, returning to his home at night from his day's work with a bag of gold on his shoulder, and that they came over here to get the princely wages that those advertisements represented they were to get. They stated frankly that but a very small percentage of them were naturalized at all, and that a very negligible per cent of them had even applied for naturalization papers. They frankly stated that their purpose was to come over here and get the rich rewards depicted on the flaming posters which had been displayed in the old countries, mostly in Italy, in Poland, and in similar countries, and to make a fortune in a few years, or what would be a fortune according to their Old World standards, and go back again. I say the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New York are obliged to concede that we do not want that class of immigrants; we do not want people to come here, as the Senator expressed it, as mere birds of passage to rob this country, to compete unfairly with the American workingman, and to strike down American standards. I think we all can agree on that proposition.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HARDWICK. With pleasure.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, having heard the able junior Senator from Georgia revive our memories in this connection with this investigation at Lawrence, Mass., I should like to ask him if it be not true, and if he can not confirm the fact, that the men who really led the violations of law at Lawrence and who were really responsible, if responsibility can be attached to any individual, for the violation of the law, were not men who could both read and write and who were regarded as educated, and that one of them was at the time proposed as a candidate for office in Italy, whence he came?

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator from Illinois refer to Giovannetti?

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; I think that was the name.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Illinois is probably right, that the leaders of that movement, as are the leaders of most movements, were educated; but their work found easy reception and fertile soil, because they had a lot of people who were ignorant, accustomed to accept any sort of leadership, and were used to being bossed, anyway; who knew nothing, and cared less, about American conditions, institutions, or laws. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make a suggestion at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is it not a fact that these educated disturbers of the public peace would have a much less fertile field if they were addressing a people equally educated with themselves?

Mr. HARDWICK. That is exactly true.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And is it not a fact, and the great reason for this very provision of the bill, that its adoption would leave no such field to set on fire by the men so much better educated who would stir those people up to acts of illegality?

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was impressed with the statement which the Senator from Georgia made with reference to the flagrant posters that were distributed in many foreign countries.

Mr. HARDWICK. Flaming posters.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Well, flaming and flagrant as well, if the Senator please. They were displayed, the assumption is from the Senator's remarks, for an evil purpose. I coupled with that the statement made on yesterday by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], that it was desirable to have a surplus of labor in order to supply the demands in manufacturing towns. I can recall very well at the time, and even before the time, of the Lawrence strike the fact came out that the steamship companies, as well as employers of labor, were eager to have these men come here, and that they resorted to methods that were misleading and unfair in order to induce them to do so. So, if those great bodies of men have come here, the same employers of labor and the great steamship lines have been the authors of this ungenerous and uncanny and unfair movement.

Mr. HARDWICK. The suspicion of the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. President, is not an unreasonable one.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It was verified by statements which I have never seen contradicted.

Mr. HARDWICK. The statement of the Senator is probably—I will go that far—quite true; and yet the evidence we took did not disclose whether or not it was true. Those men did not know who put up those posters. I can quite readily imagine—and I am quite willing to concede, so far as I have any right to concede anything about it—that probably some one put up those posters who had an interest in getting those men to come over here.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Unquestionably.

Mr. HARDWICK. They were the men who put up the money for putting up those posters, which so misrepresented conditions here; but whether the people who did this were the steamship companies, who were interested in making the passage money from these people, or whether they were the people who were interested in the labor market in the States to which these men were to be brought, and therefore interested in getting lower wages forced on working people here in America, it is impossible for me to say. The Senator from New Jersey can draw his own conclusion as well as I can draw mine.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I think it might be well, with the Senator's permission, in that connection to call attention to the statement that was made, I think, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] on yesterday, that these employees in the mills at Lawrence, Mass., had left their European homes and gone directly to those mills, a circumstance which would seem to indicate that somebody interested in the mills had something to do with putting up those posters and bringing those people here.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That has never been contradicted, although it has been broadly asserted and printed in the public press.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is probably true. I quite agree with the Senator, although I have not the direct evidence to support it. From the circumstances it looks to be true, to a man up a tree, as my friend from Missouri suggests.

But another phenomenon, a natural one, however, Mr. President, in connection with that strike was this: When these people did get in trouble, when this great horde of foreigners who came to Lawrence under those conditions and the first effect of whose importation was to beat down American wages considerably and to drive out other people—American citizens—who had been engaged at a much higher wage in that very work, when they did get over there and found out that the wages they were to get and did get were not quite so high and that conditions were not quite so flattering as had been represented to them, they were bitterly disappointed. They had expected much and they got little, and they immediately began this strike, with some encouragement, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] suggests, from educated leaders. They inaugurated this strike, and when that strike culminated and when the greatest and gravest trouble connected with it was at its very climax, these people, instead of appealing to the American law officers, instead of appealing to this Government, either to the local authorities or to the State authorities or to the authorities of the United States, about the hardships and iniquities and wrongs they claimed were inflicted upon them, turned at once, according to the sworn testimony, to the diplo-

matic and consular representatives of 16 foreign powers to protect them against an oppression in this land of the free and home of the brave, which they said was worse than any they had ever received at the hands of the Cossacks in Russia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator, since he took that evidence, if it was not shown substantially that in this land of the free the constabulary or the militia had gone to the depot, torn children from the arms of their mothers, and taken them away from them simply because those mothers were sending their children to other communities to be supported during the strike? Was not that shown by the evidence, or substantially that?

Mr. HARDWICK. I can not agree to the Senator's statement of it in those precise words; in fact, there is hardly a part of the evidence, if the Senator will permit me, that was not the subject matter of very sharp conflict and dispute.

Mr. REED. Well, was there not plenty of evidence to sustain substantially that contention?

Mr. HARDWICK. When some of those people undertook to send their children away to other parts of the country, the police undoubtedly at one time stopped them; there is no dispute about that. Of course the method they adopted is the subject matter of very sharp dispute.

Mr. REED. But in this land of the free and home of the brave, if things of that kind were done in violation of the Constitution of the United States, the constitution of Massachusetts, and the principles of the common law and the statute law, is it remarkable that these people lost some confidence in the protection they might get from our Government?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will permit me, I think he has read only a part of the evidence. If he had read it all, he would find out that these same people did not learn their distaste of the American Government or the restraints imposed by American law then. They had it before that time, and before then they had trampled upon and spit upon, according to the testimony of some, the flag of the Republic, to which the Senator has referred so often and so eloquently during his own address. They were utterly impatient, if the Senator will permit me to state my own impression of that evidence after studying both sides of it—these men were utterly impatient of restraints imposed by American law. They seem to have been taught or to have had it in their heads, somehow or other, that when they got here they would be entirely free to do exactly as they pleased; that they were going to reap a harvest; that they were going to get a bag of gold every day for the day's work; and that they could do exactly what they pleased, regardless of the restraints of law.

Mr. REED. Now may I ask a further question to elucidate this matter?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator if it disturbs him.

Mr. HARDWICK. It does not bother me at all; I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. The Senator has yielded very generously. The last statement of the Senator might lead to the impression that these people had been generally lawless after they came to Lawrence, Mass. Is it not true that this charge of lawlessness is confined practically to the time of the strike? Prior to that had they not obeyed the law as ordinary citizens do?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think that is true. Until the strike itself came there was little lawlessness; but after the strike began, if the Senator will permit me, they seemed to be utterly impatient of all restraint, of all order, and of any attempt to make them obey the statutes.

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator wants to be fair—

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly I do.

Mr. REED. Is not that generally true in most strikes?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will permit me, I do not believe there have been many strikes in this country in which American workmen have participated where there has been anything like the degree of utter disregard of all law and the utter contempt of all authority such as was displayed during the Lawrence strike; and I think that if the Senator will read that evidence and compare it with anything he has ever heard, he will agree that that is probably the truth.

Mr. REED. Well, the conditions must have been pretty bad.

Mr. HARDWICK. They were pretty bad.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I should like to ask him a question, or, rather, to make a deduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. These people, as I understand, had been induced to come to this country by flaming posters, which pictured to them a condition of affairs under which they would make a bag of gold or a large amount of emolument. They had been induced to come to this country under intimations that they would be very prosperous; that it was a good place to come to; and that they would enjoy happiness, and make much money. And then, after they got here, they found themselves up against starvation wages and ill-ventilated shops in which to work, and found themselves charged for drinking water, as I understand happened in some of these places. Under such circumstances would not almost anyone become rather impatient with conditions?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think he would; I quite agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. LANE. And would he not be likely to get a little bit restless and have rather a spirit of irreverence for the country?

Mr. HARDWICK. I expect that is true; there are two sides to it, of course. If the Senator will pardon me, these people were not altogether to blame. They had their wrongs; they were brought here by flagrant misrepresentation of conditions, and of course I do not blame them for being disappointed. The point is, they went a long way after they once got started to show their contempt of all authority and disobedience of all law, their utter irreverence for our institutions or for anything they had found after they got here. It is not strange that they did so, because they were badly disappointed at what they found after the representations made to them to which I have referred.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator made any effort to discover what percentage of these men could read and write? That is the question.

Mr. HARDWICK. I can not tell you the exact percentage; I am not positive as to that, but my recollection of the evidence, I will say to the Senator, is that most of these people were illiterate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. They could not read or write?

Mr. HARDWICK. That is the general impression left on my mind, although I can not point to the testimony just on this point.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator, further, whether he believes that if these men could read and write the riot would immediately have been allayed?

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me answer the Senator that I think that if they had had sense enough to read and write they would not have been fools enough to be deceived by the posters to which I have referred.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. They would not have come here at all?

Mr. HARDWICK. They would have remained away.

Now, Mr. President, I want to lay down another proposition, which is that the immigrant who is not of a type and character capable of assimilation into our body politic is an undesirable immigrant. Whatever the standard of living or the conditions of living in the country that he came from, that immigrant must be capable of lifting himself to our standard rather than attempting or helping to lower our standard to the same level as that to which he had been accustomed or he is still an undesirable immigrant. The immigrant must be capable of making a good citizen and a reasonably intelligent citizen or he is undesirable.

He is not, Mr. President, in my judgment, capable of making a desirable citizen unless he has in him the material from which a desirable voter can eventually be made. In this country, and in all other countries where popular rule is supreme and the individual voter is sovereign, it is all important, if this Government is to endure and if our institutions are to survive, that the individual voter be reasonably intelligent; otherwise he is incapable, however good his intentions may be, of making correct decisions on the mighty issues of government that must be and are submitted to him.

I do not understand the line of reasoning that would lead any Senator to believe that the standard imposed by the possession of a reasonable amount of education is not a good general rule for the ascertainment of intelligence. I quite admit, as Senators have eloquently argued and urged on this floor, that there are many exceptions to the rule. Like all other rules, it is proved by its exceptions. Sometimes you will find a most intelligent man who can neither read nor write and who has had no education whatever, while at other times you will find people who can read and write, those who can barely do so, or even those

who can do so with some fluency and readiness, who have no real intelligence. After all, in spite of the exceptions on the one side and the exceptions on the other side, the rule that you can discover and ascertain the existence of intelligence by an educational test is a sound one. It is so sound that many of the Commonwealths of this Republic have applied it in conferring or withholding the voting privilege.

The Senator from Missouri, almost at the end of his speech, said that there had been few of the American Commonwealths that had imposed standards based on intelligence, except the Southern States, where he claimed racial conditions were entirely responsible. In addition to the States of the South, I should like to call his attention to the election laws of the States of Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Ohio, Oregon, California, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, and Vermont.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And Arizona.

Mr. HARDWICK. And Arizona, as the Senator from Arizona suggests.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the Senator can add New Hampshire to his list.

Mr. HARDWICK. And New Hampshire, as the Senator from New Hampshire suggests. Now, it will be seen that in many parts of this Republic the people realize that the sound rule by which to ascertain the possession of intelligence is the possession of a certain amount of education. Not only that, but, with one solitary exception, possibly two, I think every State in this great Republic requires in another way the possession of some intelligence on the part of its electorate by establishing and maintaining the Australian ballot system. The requirement imposed in this way is not quite so severe as some of the other tests imposed in some of the Commonwealths, but generally, especially in recent years, Mr. President, it has become the accepted policy throughout this Republic to limit the franchise to people who are reasonably intelligent and who can exercise it with a reasonable degree of safety to the great public interests that are involved.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in connection with the statement just made by the Senator, I desire to remind him that the Legislature of the State of Colorado at its last session adopted what is called the "headless ballot," which is the pure Australian ballot and which requires, of course, an educational qualification if it is properly exercised. In order to enforce the growth of that qualification all assistance to the voter there is now prohibited, except in cases where he is physically unable to act.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the Senator from Colorado for the suggestion, and I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and all the other Senators who have strengthened and supplemented the statement that I have made on that question.

Now, Mr. President, reverting to the argument from the standpoint of the public interest, from the standpoint of the general good of this Republic, I do not wish to admit to our shores immigrants who do not make good citizens and who will not eventually make good voters. In this age of intelligence, of free schools everywhere, of compulsory education in many of the Commonwealths, as pointed out by Senators on this floor, at this period when we are spending in this Republic \$700,000,000 a year on the common schools alone, to say nothing of the other institutions of learning, it seems to me that it is not an unreasonable requirement, in the interest of the public good, to say to the immigrant who seeks admission to our country and who comes to our shores, "If you want to become an American citizen—and we do not want you unless you do wish it—eventually you should become an American voter; we do not wish to add to whatever ignorance we may deplorably have in this country already by admitting you if you do not come up to a reasonable standard of intelligence. It is necessary that you should have a reasonable amount of intelligence if you are to make an acceptable and desirable citizen of this great Republic."

From the standpoint of the public interest, Mr. President and Senators, it seems to me that the argument is unanswerable. I am too anxious to see this bill pass, too anxious to see it come to a speedy vote, to delay the Senate very long by an extended and elaborate argument on this branch of the question, and I have some other ground I desire to cover, so I will pass on from this point.

Now, the literacy test provided in this bill is very reasonable. It provides for bare ability to read, after the age of 16, not English, not the language they must speak here if they are really to become a part and parcel of this country, but their own language, any language, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

This test not only provides a reasonable general standard, but, as pointed out by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], this test, as shown by the report of the able commission of Congress that thoroughly investigated this question through long months and years, will at once greatly check the most undesirable streams of immigration that are now pouring into this country.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] wanted to know what those undesirable streams of immigrants were. The Senator from Vermont, I think, hesitated to specify. No such considerations shall move me. I do not hesitate to specify them. In my judgment it is the people from the southern parts of Europe, the most illiterate, who come here with the intention, in many cases, of remaining with us for a brief sojourn and of then returning to their own countries, that we must stop; and according to the report of this commission, which I have studied, those are the streams of immigration that will be most certainly and most effectually checked by this test, if it should be applied.

Mr. President and Senators, one of the distinguished Senators who spoke against the literacy test and in favor of the amendment to it proposed by the Senator from Colorado appealed to the South particularly on this question. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] said that as long as the South had a very small percentage of these people of foreign birth she was not, therefore, intimately and directly concerned with the solution of this great question, and ought to hearken to the political necessities of her northern brethren.

In all kindness to the Senator from New York and to all others who entertain that view, I wish to enter my emphatic protest, my utter dissent from it. Are we to be forever appealed to on the ground that the South will take a narrow and provincial view of any great question that may come before this body or before the American people? Are we not at last, in truth and in fact, Americans as well as the balance of you? If so, let us hear no more appeals to the South to do something for local reasons or because of no direct or local concern.

Why, the Senator from New York suggested that this question stood somewhat on all fours with certain other questions—local, I think, and the Senator thought so, too; of a local nature—like prohibition, like woman suffrage; questions that each Commonwealth, according to my judgment, ought to dispose of for itself under our dual system of government. But it seems to me that the question at issue here in this bill is not comparable to those questions, and does not belong to the same class at all. If there ever was a purely national question, an entirely and essentially nation-wide question, for the consideration of the American people and the American Congress, it is the question as to what immigrants we shall admit at our ports and to our shores, because when once these immigrants come here they can go to every State in the Republic. They have certain rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States and by our treaties with foreign powers, rights that no State can deny or withhold.

Tell me that Georgia ought not to vote and voice its convictions on this floor because of the political necessities of New York, Missouri, or somewhere else, because we have not many of these people now? Ah, gentlemen, that sort of an argument does not appeal to me. It seems to me that the State of Georgia has just as much right and just as much duty to voice its Americanism on this question as New York or Missouri, Illinois or New Hampshire, or any other part of this Republic. It is a great national question. There is no local issue in it; and I am bound, as a Senator from Georgia, as I see my duty, to vote for the best interests of the American people as a whole, as I can best see and understand those interests.

I want to say another thing. The appeal was made that we should reject the literacy test for party reasons, for partisan reasons, to aid the Democratic Party in certain States and certain sections of this country. Mr. President, I doubt if there is on this floor, on either side of this Chamber, a more thorough partisan than I believe I am, and yet it does seem to me that there are some questions that ought not to be partisan. It does seem to me that there are some times and some occasions when a man ought to put his idea of the country's good above the party's good, even if it be conceded that the party's good is at stake in this sort of a measure. If I believe that a measure of this kind, or of any other kind for that matter, is all-important for the interests of my country, I can not be appealed to successfully to sacrifice my views or yield my vote because of the interests, alleged or fancied, of the Democratic Party in some other section of this Republic.

I can not agree to the soundness of the proposition, and I can not act in accordance with any such appeal. So far as that is concerned, I believe that the Senators who speak so elo-

quently on this question are wrong on the proposition of party expediency. Although I do not live in the sections of the Republic where they have their great political battles, I am not an entire stranger to conditions there, and I believe, so far as political strength is concerned, they would make more headway by standing with us for what we believe is the correct policy, in keeping out undesirable immigration into this country, than they will by standing for a lot of sentimentality that is not based on reason and that is principally good for speech making.

The question is not a new one. Since my public service in this Congress it has been thrashed out many times. We are not jumping in the dark, as my friend the Senator from Missouri suggested, on any of these things. There is no one question that has been so thoroughly thrashed out, that has been so closely studied by able and competent commissions, and on which we have such a great volume of accurate and reliable testimony as this one, in my judgment.

I want to call the attention of the Senate briefly to a short abstract I prepared some years ago on the progress of legislation on this subject.

Outside of the Chinese-exclusion act of 1888 and the various acts amendatory thereof and providing means for its enforcement the following is a brief summary of our progress in restrictive legislation on the subject of immigration:

The first restrictive law was that of March 5, 1875. It provided that persons convicted of felony, other than strictly political offenses, should not be allowed to immigrate to this country, and by the act of August 3, 1882, provision was made for the deportation of such convicts.

By the act of February 26, 1885, it was made unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to prepay the fare to this country of any laborer who was under contract to work out such passage money. This was the first of our laws against the importation of contract labor. The methods and means of enforcing this law were the subject matter of the acts of February 23, 1887, and October 19, 1888.

On March 3, 1881, was approved the first attempt to enact a general and comprehensive restrictive immigration law. For that reason it is both interesting and important to observe its provisions.

In that law the following seven classes of immigrants were excluded from our shores:

- (1) Idiots and insane persons.
- (2) Paupers and persons liable to become public charges.
- (3) Persons affected with loathsome or dangerous or contagious diseases.
- (4) Women imported for immoral purposes.
- (5) Persons convicted of a felony other than political felonies.
- (6) Polygamists.
- (7) Contract laborers.

It will be observed that only five of these classes were new, felons having been excluded by the act of 1875 and contract laborers by the act of 1885.

On March 3, 1893, Congress passed another act to provide for the further and more complete enforcement of the act of 1891; but the continual increase of immigration, from about 560,000 in 1891 to 857,000 in 1903, led to the first of our really great and comprehensive immigration laws—the act of March 3, 1903. In that act the seven classes already excluded by the act of 1891 were again excluded, the definitions of each class being more clearly stated and strengthened, and new and important classes were added, such as anarchists, the opponents of all organized government, and those who advocated the assassination of public officers. Transportation companies were forbidden to solicit emigration, and a head tax of \$2 for each immigrant was enacted. It is also provided in this act that persons who had immigrated into this country in violation of any of the provisions of law could be deported at any time within two years thereafter. Ample machinery was provided for its enforcement, and the act was passed with the belief that it would cut down immigration and would certainly improve its character. It did not come up to the expectations of its friends, however, because in 1907, 1,285,000 immigrants were pouring into this country and came in that year.

On the subject of our immigrants and their illiteracy there are certain figures here that I should like to call to the attention of the Senate.

In 1902 we had 857,000 immigrants into this country, 21 per cent of whom were illiterate.

In 1904 we had 812,000 immigrants into this country, 21 per cent of whom, in round numbers, were illiterate.

In 1905 we had 1,026,000 immigrants into this country, 22 per cent of whom were illiterate.

In 1906 we had 1,100,000 immigrants into this country, 24 per cent of whom were illiterate.

In 1907 we had 1,285,000 immigrants into this country, 26 per cent of whom were illiterate.

Early in 1906 the Senate Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported, through Senator DILLINGHAM, a bill providing more drastic and comprehensive restrictions on immigration.

When that bill finally passed the Senate on May 23, 1906, an amendment, first proposed by Senator SIMMONS, of North Carolina, and afterwards modified and improved by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, was adopted providing a simple literacy test for immigrants; the requirement being that all immigrants into this country above 16 years old, and not physically incapacitated, must be able to read the English language or some other language. When the House committee reported the bill it still retained the literacy test, but on June 25, 1907, when the House voted on the bill, the literacy test was stricken from it by a very close vote (128 to 116) upon motion of Mr. Grosvenor (Republican), of Ohio.

The literacy test being stricken out by the House and the Senate firmly standing by it, it seemed that the conferees would never be able to agree and consequently that the bill would never pass. It probably would never have done so but for the trouble with Japan, growing out of labor conditions and school troubles in California and all along the Pacific slope. When those troubles came on in the latter part of 1906 and early in 1907 this bill was revitalized and under party whip and spur passed, by compromise, the literacy test being left out of the bill, and provision being made that the President of the United States should be given the discretion not to permit Japanese (or other foreign) immigration under passports issued by any foreign Government to other countries or to any insular possession of the United States or to the Canal Zone, "whenever he was of the opinion" that to admit the holders of such passports to continental United States was to the "detriment of labor conditions here."

In the last session of the Sixty-second Congress, in the closing days of the Taft administration, a bill that was in substance the same as the pending bill and had the same literacy test, passed both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by President Taft. It was then passed by this body by a two-thirds vote over the veto, and failed by a few votes to get the necessary two-thirds in the House of Representatives.

During all these years illiteracy among the immigrants that come to us is constantly increasing. Furthermore, explaining to the Senator from Missouri and to other Senators who may be interested why I did not hesitate to specify the peoples from the south of Europe as undesirable sources of immigration, I wish to say the reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration show that in the years 1905, 1906, and 1907 of the immigrants that came to us from northern and western Europe but 3.7 per cent are illiterate, while of the immigrants who came from southern Europe nearly 50 per cent, or 42.2 per cent, are illiterate.

Therefore I say those are the streams that we ought to check; and I think the other reason that I gave is also applicable, because those are the people who come here for temporary sojourn more than all others.

Mr. President, I want to state to the Senate in just a few words a summary of the reasons why I favor this bill, which not only increases the restrictive provisions generally against this immigration, but also carries in its provisions the literacy test.

First, I favor it to protect American labor from unfair competition—competition that strips the country bare to enrich other lands, as well as capitalists in our own, and that tends to lower every American standard.

Second, to aid in securing—that is, the literacy test, particularly—a reasonably intelligent electorate for this Republic.

Third, to preserve the American system of government, with all of its standards and ideals, handed down to us by our fathers.

Some particular comment has been made throughout this debate on the little interest that the South ought to have in this question, because she has such a small percentage of foreign-born population within her borders. Let us look at the figures for a minute and see if we can not get something from them.

If we start on the banks of the Potomac and go straight through the very heart of the South to the Rio Grande, we find that in Virginia only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the entire population is foreign born; in North Carolina only three-tenths of 1 per cent; in South Carolina, four-tenths of 1 per cent; in Georgia, six-tenths of 1 per cent; in Alabama, nine-tenths of 1 per cent; in Mississippi, five-tenths of 1 per cent; in Louisiana,

3.2 per cent; in Texas, 6.2 per cent; an average of 1.6 per cent for the Southern States that I have named. If we take the eleven States that formed the Southern Confederacy, we find that the average percentage of foreign-born population in them is only 1.8 per cent.

Turn for a moment to the other sections of this country, and what do we find? We find 11 great States—3 in New England, 2 in the Middle Atlantic group, and 6 in the Northwest and in the far West—where the percentage of foreign-born population is so large as to be appalling. Let me give you the list of these States, with their percentages:

Rhode Island, 32 per cent; Massachusetts, 31.5 per cent; New York, 30.2 per cent; Connecticut, 29.6 per cent; North Dakota, 27.1 per cent; Minnesota, 26.2 per cent; New Jersey, 26 per cent; Montana, 25.2 per cent; California, 24.7 per cent; Arizona, 23.9 per cent; or an average of 27.4 per cent in the States I have named.

Mr. REED. Foreign born?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir—not of foreign parentage.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator state when those figures were prepared, and for what period?

Mr. HARDWICK. They were prepared from the very best available statistics, and they were prepared less than six months ago from the latest census reports—those of 1910.

The average for these States, as I have stated, is 27.4. According to the same authority—that is, the census of 1910—the average percentage of the foreign-born population of the New England States is 27.9 per cent; that of the Middle Atlantic States is 25.1; and that of the Pacific States is 22.8.

It must be remembered also that these figures do not include citizens born on this soil of foreign parentage. I have not been able to find the official figures on the question of persons of foreign parentage reduced to the percentage basis; but in addition to the population in this country that is of foreign birth the census reports of 1910 show that 18,897,837 were born of foreign parentage, besides 13,343,583 that are of foreign birth. There are over 31,000,000 in the two classes, you see. In the State of Georgia, however, we have only 25,672 persons of foreign parentage, as against 1,395,058 born of native white parents; and the other Southern States maintain almost as good an average on this question as does the State of Georgia.

Such is the situation. These are the conditions that confront us, as disclosed by the official reports of this Government. I do not advert to it in either alarming style or sensational fashion. Nothing is further from my purpose. I have full, yea overwhelming, sympathy with the noble idea that this great country of ours should afford to the oppressed and to the virtuous of every land an asylum of refuge from persecution and injustice, but first of all I would care for our own. I acknowledge in ungrudging measure the great debt of gratitude that we owe to those people of other and less fortunate lands who have sought and found a happier home in our own, giving generously of their brain and brawn to the progress and the prosperity of the Republic, renouncing all conflicting allegiances to become true and loyal American citizens. To such men—and I thank God the vast majority of our southern citizens of foreign birth or lineage can be so classified—no man can extend a heartier welcome than I; but I can not be insensible, nor can you, Senators, to the great dangers that are involved in this situation.

Because we welcome the worthy and the virtuous from every land where they are capable of assimilation with our own people, I do not believe we can afford to welcome here the scum of the earth from every land, who come to this land not to become a part of it but to strip it bare, to take the bread of labor from American mouths, and to carry it back in triumph to some foreign shore.

Nor can I be insensible to the great danger to our American system of government that is involved in the continued and increasing influx of some classes of these foreigners. They know nothing of American history, and care less. They know nothing of American traditions and institutions, and care less. In large part they do not speak and can not or will not learn our language. They come here filled with all sorts of socialistic, anarchistic, and nihilistic ideas, a fact which can not always be proved at the immigration station, impatient of all restraints imposed by law, and utterly and supremely indifferent to the welfare of that country in which they propose to linger only long enough to make enough money to support them in comfort elsewhere.

Mr. President, I can not help but feel, I can not help but believe, and I believe it profoundly, that the gravest danger this country and this system of government can ever be sub-

jected to is liable to come from these people who come over here not as the people to whom my friend, the Senator from Missouri, referred so eloquently to-day and yesterday, to become a part and parcel of this country, who are capable of assimilation into our body politic, and whose sons and daughters are fit to intermarry with our sons and daughters, but who come here for the purposes of industrial exploitation, utterly ignorant of the history, the traditions, the sentiments, and the institutions of this country, and utterly indifferent to them.

It seems to me that the pending bill, particularly through the literacy test, is calculated to stop the most vicious, the most dangerous, of these elements. I have supported it for years in another branch of Congress. I had the privilege of reporting from the Committee on Rules, under a special rule, the very bill that we are now considering, when it was reported to the other House of Congress. For years I have stood for it. I have voted to pass it more than once, and once over the veto of a President of the United States. I believe in the literacy test with all my heart and soul; and I know that when I give my vote and voice for this measure I voice the will, the sentiment, and the belief of the great Commonwealth of Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS. Does the Senator from Louisiana desire to occupy the floor?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I may speak for about one minute on the amendment only.

Mr. LEWIS. I should prefer to yield.

Mr. THORNTON. I have no desire to speak now. I understand the Senator is prepared with a set speech.

Mr. LEWIS. No; I have no set speech.

Mr. THORNTON. I have no desire to speak now.

Mr. LEWIS. I only wanted to yield to the Senator if he desired to take the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield to me for just one moment?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield completely, if the Senator desires.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask permission to have placed in the Record a clipping from the Washington Star of last evening, showing that the immigration of the last fiscal year reached a total of 1,485,957. This newspaper article also deals with the difficulty of medical officers making proper inspection of the tremendous number of immigrants that are pouring into the ports of the United States. I ask consent that it be placed in the Record without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator.

The matter referred to is as follows:

IMMIGRANTS REACHING UNITED STATES TOTAL 1,485,957 IN YEAR—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SHOWS GREAT DIFFICULTY IN MEDICALLY INSPECTING ALL.

Railways and steamship lines brought into the United States in the last fiscal year a total of 1,485,957 immigrants, according to a statement of the Public Health Service, just issued. These immigrants entered this country at 80 points of entry, including 25 seaports, and they came to the land of the free from 25 different foreign ports.

These figures are given in the Public Health Service's statement to show the magnitude of the task of medically inspecting the vast horde of aliens that enter the United States each year. More than 100 steamship lines bring immigrants to this country, and by reason of the fact that some of the ocean lines have vessels arriving at from two to five American ports, it has been found that there are 173 lines of immigrant travel from foreign countries to the shores of Uncle Sam's domain.

The number of immigrants examined at the different ports and places varied; for instance, from 1 examined at Wilmington, N. C., to 1,009,854 at the port of New York during the last fiscal year. In addition to this, 80,322 immigrants arrived at Boston, 40,248 at Baltimore, and 60,483 at Philadelphia during the last fiscal year, the total being as stated above.

As a result of the examination of the above-mentioned 1,485,957 immigrants 41,236 were certified as having diseases either deportable or reportable under the immigration laws. In order to give the medical examination to such a large number of immigrants it is necessary that the officers of the Public Health Service detailed for this duty be specialists in the various lines of diseases.

These officers, when they examine large numbers of immigrants, at once seek first to eliminate the perfectly sound persons, which they are able to do with remarkable accuracy on account of their long practice. The remaining immigrants are then disposed of in the order of the importance of their diseases. For example, if an immigrant has a slight deformity which will not bar him from entering the country, he is detained only long enough for a record to be made of this deformity. This soon leaves only those immigrants who are to be subjected to a careful examination to determine whether they are likely to become public charges if admitted to the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Illinois pardon me for a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, gladly, Mr. President—gladly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think we are now drawing to a point where every effort should be made to have a vote on this bill. I said in the beginning that I was not going to attempt to shut off any debate nor seek to prevent

those who disagree with the committee from expressing themselves fully. Those who are in favor of the bill have refrained from any very lengthy discussion of it, believing that the country was pretty well satisfied and would stand with the Congress in reference to it.

I sincerely hope those who intend to address the Senate on this bill will be prepared, because, so far as the rules will allow me, I shall force a vote on the bill at the earliest possible moment when debate shall have been exhausted.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, for myself I will yield to the chairman of the committee if he cares to present any views at this time. I will yield gladly, and when he has concluded, if there are some matters I care to offer, I will take the liberty of doing so in a very short period of time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not care to address the Senate at this time. There are some general facts in reference to certain statistics that have been given and points made that I, at the conclusion of the debate, may take the time of the Senate to refer to. Otherwise we will come to a vote.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if there is no one else who desires at this time to occupy the floor, there are a few views I should like to express; but I desire to yield to any other Senator who would care to occupy the floor at this time, whether he is for or against the measure.

As there seems to be none who desires at this time to be heard, I wish to put into the RECORD the dissent that I have from the feature of the bill and from the provision known as the literacy test.

I recognize that the support of this measure and its opposition is largely guided by the question of locality. I recognize very firmly that a man is impressed by the constituency he represents and that, however much he may desire to speak a general view applicable to his country at large, he is greatly influenced by the situation surrounding him at his home, and something of the political considerations of the constituency for which he speaks. For myself I confess, without reservation, that I am greatly concerned as to this limitation from two viewpoints:

One is that as an American, with my attitude addressed to that which I understand my country stands for, I can not give it my approval.

Second, the interest of the class of people who make up approximately one-half of the population of the great city in which I live and a very large percentage of the splendid State that I have the honor in part to represent admonishes me that I can not allow a provision to be introduced and passed as a law while I am their representative which they feel lays a bar sinister against those of their blood—their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers—and places a barrier of the future against any advance or opportunity to those now born or hereafter to be born whose only misfortune is that they live in a land where despotism exercises its powers upon them and opportunity of complete freedom has been denied them.

Mr. President, I take the liberty to accept the invitation of the honorable chairman of the committee to present such objections as I have. First, I have tendered a motion to strike out this section in so far as it contains a clause making the educational test or test of literacy a standard of admission into this country. I address myself at this time to the motion of my own and at the same time to the merits of this amendment.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] evidently is not on the floor. There is a matter I should like to call to his attention that embarrasses me very much. To the Senator from Missouri, the distinguished gentleman who has lately regaled us with a most edifying exhibition of his learning upon this question generally and his wonderful industry, I should like also to confess that I am very much embarrassed with this amendment.

This amendment, as well as the provision in this bill, reads that no one shall be excluded who is fleeing from either religious or political persecution, also that anyone shall be admitted by the officers of our Government who may be adjudged as having fled from religious or political persecution. The fear I have lies in the complications to my Government which either the provision in the bill or the amendment will undoubtedly entail. The moment we establish it in the discretion of any administrative officers to render decisions that they admit A, B, or C upon the grounds that A, B, and C are then the victims of religious or political persecution from a certain named country we authorize our administrative officers to indict that country as being guilty of religious persecution or political persecution. We therefore give our approval to such administrative indictments by our Government, therefore holding them up before the world as having been convicted by America of having inflicted religious persecution upon A, or that we admit having found

judgment against that foreign country for the political persecution of B, and therefore admit him and thus impliedly likewise enter judgment of condemnation against that country.

Then we awaken, I fear, by those provisions a legitimate form of retaliation on the part of those countries by their administrative officers in the administration of some of their particular Provinces to pass upon the property rights of some of our citizens who may be living abroad, the right as to whether he is a real American or an affected one, whether he is really a foreigner notwithstanding he contends he is an American, and impress him into domestic military service on the theory that they have the right through their administrative officers to decide that he is a mere ruse, a mere pretense, a mere hypocrisy. If we vest in our administrative officers the right to pass a judgment of condemnation upon the foreign countries on the ground that they are persecuting for religious purposes a citizen, and we permit him to enter with that judgment against them, they have a grievance against us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me?

Mr. LEWIS. Oh, yes; I prefer to be interrupted. I may be wrong, and I want the view of the Senator.

Mr. REED. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the language he is now criticizing is the language of the bill, not of the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. That is correct. I am now speaking of the bill—that feature of the bill and to the amendments of similar purport—which to my thinking offers such opportunity of so great offense to the foreign countries as to invite serious conflicts and entail upon us complications which may have a result very embarrassing and at this particular time particularly dangerous. I illustrate:

Suppose a Turk, a subject of the Ottoman Empire, who claims to be an Armenian, comes to the gates of Castle Garden and applies for admission. He can not read or write, and he is subject to the inhibition of the bill. But through an interpreter or a representative he shall have it manifested that he is fleeing; that from the fact of being a Christian the Turkish Government is charged by him with persecuting him. It shall be so manifested to those to whom we have committed this discretion, and the commissioners there and the commissioner here at Washington shall decide to uphold his statements, affirm his accusation, and give judgment in his favor. What will it be? It will be that Selim Ibrahim, or whatever may be the name of the kind, is admitted into the United States on the ground that he is an exile or refugee from religious persecution visited upon him by the Government of Turkey. So thus we have indicted Turkey and found her guilty by an administrative judgment of our own officers which we must give approval to by giving the man the right of entrance.

Second, a Jew from Russia comes to our gates. He can not read or write. Likewise he comes within the inhibition of the measure, but those interpreting for him say that he is fleeing from political persecution. They manifest it in such a way that those commissioners say, "We adopt it as true." They write a judgment that Joseph Abraham can not read or write, he is within the inhibition of the law, but nevertheless we find that he has been persecuted for political purposes by Russia, and because of this political persecution of Russia we admit him. Result: We indict Russia as being guilty of political persecution and by that indictment enter judgment against her.

I need hardly say to my esteemed colleague that by a multiplication of these instances we have an army of affronts against these different nations and give them an opportunity to retaliate against the property of our people wherever they may be located in foreign countries, or against our people wherever opportunity may arise of a nature so fraught with danger that one step further may bring resentment by it for wrong done in retaliation, and we will find ourselves in a very serious conflict.

I now refer to the personal feature. Expressing sympathy for the unfortunate condition of the Jew as depicted through all history in which he has suffered, recognizing the conditions to which all of us at any time address our sympathy, I fear that if my country shall inaugurate the precedent of finding a judgment at Castle Garden against Russia on the ground that she has been guilty of political persecution, we will awaken her treatment of retaliation against the Jew there to so cruel an extent that the hardships visited upon him will be multiplied in numbers there to such measure and more severe in character than otherwise would be visited upon him.

Therefore this provision in the bill at the outset I regard a dangerous one. I see it filled, measuring it as I must, with very serious consequences to my country. I see it also, as I view it, fraught with great danger and injury to those who are the subjects and objects of our solicitude and supposedly of our protection.

The amendment offered by the learned Senator from Colorado has a phrase in it that arrests my attention seriously. Knowing him to be a very eminent lawyer, having knowledge of his capacity long before I had the honor to join service with him in this body, I know he will agree with me that if we adopt in this body an amendment which authorizes the admission of persons into this country who it may be said had been the subjects of persecution for their religion or their politics, and we added to that "and this to be true, whether disclosed by overt acts or general conduct," we then call for those to render the judgment and to inscribe under that amendment the proof of the judgment.

The proof therefore would have to be some assertion on their part of an act that they said was an overt act on the part of that foreign Government or conduct which they would have to specifically define in some form or way. Therefore we make the issue specifically, and they have a right to be heard upon it. We can not render *ex parte* the judgment and find the facts without hearing the other side and then upon all render judgment. How would they have a right to be heard? Through their representatives or their ambassador or minister; and then we create a forum in our own country to retry a matter of fact, and we pass judgment whether that particular fact is overt as a fact sufficient upon which to enter judgment. When we differ then from the foreign country in their construction we again give particular offense. I fear that it must be too plain to the eyes of a thinking man for us to hope to avoid the complication.

Seeing, therefore, in the passage of the bill—likewise in the proposed amendment—expressions that I feel involve us in serious trouble and great danger, I prefer to avoid them both by striking out of the bill the particular provisions that have given rise and made necessary or seem to justify those particular resorts which either the framers of the bill had in their minds at one time or the distinguished Senator from Colorado, aided by the Senator from Missouri, have in their minds at this time.

Mr. President, I must concede that there will arise in this Government a time when indiscriminate immigration must be the subject of some form of qualification. I must concede that there must arise in my country an hour or a season when some form of defined qualification would be necessary and serviceable. I am not prepared to say it has now reached us. I find myself by every instinct within me inclined to the ideals which the fathers founded in this country of opening the gates of this Nation to those who are oppressed and seek an asylum of liberty and refuge of freedom. It is enough for me that I can view the broad waste of land expanding before the eyes, far out in the West, unoccupied, literally an empire that may today inhabit, care for, guard, and protect all the citizens of all Europe—with the single exception of Russia—without intrenching in the slightest degree upon the physical liberty of any existing American.

I do fear, Mr. President, the hour when my country shall begin to break down these ideals and shatter these foundations. My mind reverts to an interesting incident that possibly the able Senators about me recall as recorded in history. When Lowell was representing this country in England Guizot, the French historian, happening to be visiting London, it is reported that he addressed Mr. Lowell and said, "How long, Mr. Lowell, do you think your Republic will last as such?" To which Lowell is reported to have said, "Just so long, sire, as the sons shall be faithful to the ideals of the fathers." Having some regard, Mr. President, to this creed, I hesitate to adopt a policy that shall remove the sons from obedience to these ideals.

I recognize, Mr. President, that there may be questions that require some careful study and the application of some wisdom to a future condition that can arise and may apply to this country.

What, therefore, is the object of the bill? I gather that the object of the bill is to place some barrier on immigration. Why? Upon the ground, you say, that it invites ignorant and unlettered human beings into the Government. If that were the principal object, I am compelled to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that they gathered up millions of such in the Philippine Islands and placed them in the body of the Government by a mere act of conquest, and the reports demonstrate that more than 4,000,000 of those individuals have not the slightest conception of the matter of education or learning. So there can not be the same solicitude against some one entering into our Government who may be unlettered. It would seem rather late to consider that.

Shall it be my distinguished friends from the South, for whom I have great affection of course, from my birth and tender

associations, when we have in Porto Rico, with an illiteracy reported of 22 per cent, all put into the Government at the very door and gate of our Nation, all of whom, under our Constitution, have the right to come and go as they please in every State of our Union?

What was the solicitude of my distinguished friend from Vermont, the very able Senator, former chairman of this committee in the previous Senate, now the ranking minority member, against the coming in of those who were illiterate or lacking literacy when these particular measures I refer to were foisted upon the Nation?

I must therefore conclude that there is another purpose, not simply the object of avoiding those who may not read or write, and that purpose must be to prohibit or limit immigration. Mr. President, why? I assume that able Senators have not expressed their whole reason, and that in the mind of some of the Senators espousing this measure the conditions of war in Europe menace them or admonish them that when the war is concluded there will be thousands upon thousands attempting to find their refuge here in our country. I assume that there are Senators who feel that this is an approaching danger which should be avoided, and that to these able Senators there has been communicated from certain gentlemen who mean well and have an honest fear in behalf of labor that such might be the fate to be visited upon the toiler.

Mr. President, Patrick Henry is supposed to have uttered in the House of Burgesses an interesting bit of philosophy, though Aristotle seems to have expressed something of the same kind. From Henry we delight to quote that—

We can only judge the future by the past; I have no lamp to guide my feet but experience.

I call attention to the fact that immediately following the great wars of the world immigration has ceased; it has not been stimulated. I call attention to the history, familiar to my learned friends about me, that when France and Germany had their conflict and after Sedan, when one might have imagined that from France or Germany would have come teeming thousands of those who sought to rescue themselves from conditions unbearable, at least certainly not agreeable, when one might presume they might have emigrated, we discovered to the contrary; their fields were open; their children had to be maintained; their lands to be sustained; new opportunity to all survivors had arisen. France not only gathered itself together, but its people multiplied around its farms and habitations and grew into such affluence that it was able to pay the great indemnity levied by Germany, and in science and small arts became one of the superiors of the earth.

Germany, from a country that was a fifth-rate power, held her people close to her fireside, stimulated by patriotism, builded her farms, inspired their education, reanimated their hearts, filled their souls with desire for superiority among mankind, and, barring the instances of those who fled under the charge of some form of political offense, such as in 1848, there was, indeed, little immigration. It did not begin until 1885 from Germany, and then when peace had settled upon the community and arts of industry and science and the refinements of culture had possessed its country to the extent that the nation started upon the splendid course of eminence and glory, which all friends of Germany delight to certify to.

Shall I refer to my own land? Here sits around me the sons of the Confederate soldier and around me likewise those of the Federal. They have not much memory of it, possibly, but they have a memory of that which was related to them by their fathers. When the South and the North had that unfortunate conflict, when that cataclysm severed us apart and sent the two sons of one mother to die by the bayonet of the brother, and it was all ended, did our people in the South forsake their hearthstones, fly from their people and take refuge elsewhere? No; they returned from the battle field to the farm. They returned from a soldier's lot to a civilian's pride. They returned from the camp to the home and builded the South to a splendid degree of affluence and a glory of eminence in letters and statesmanship, which has been the pride of every American to allude to wherever the history of this country is recounted. Did our honorable opponents—speaking as a southerner—of the Federal Army, forsake the hills of Vermont or New Hampshire? Did they leave Ohio and the broad rivers of the West? Not at all. They builded New England anew. They started ablaze the manufacturing eminence and fortunes, set her glowing furnaces out on every rock-side, her little cities multiplied in number and manufacturing arts; and increased was the splendor of her people. Her literary masters and her colleges became the pride of New England, and her sons, moving into a second and third generation,

peopled the far West with intelligence and respectability to a degree that every State in the West rejoices to pay tribute to.

Did the men of the great Middle West, which had tendered so much in that splendid sacrifice, forsake their homes? Far from it. They likewise took new life, new vigor, the sons to the plow, the boys to the store, all the family to the home, and builded the great country and the eminence of the empire where she stands the marvel of the world and all mankind who view the achievements of men wherever they reach wonderful altitudes.

So, I must feel that it is the truth that after great wars shall have severed people and left them destitute for a while, they do not flee from the charred ruins, the stripped home, the pained scene, the graves of their dead. They build commerce, homes, churches; reerect their habitations, their mansions of industry, their factories of toil, and their homes of comfort.

If I were inclined to adopt the fear of many gentlemen whose views of course we greatly respect—in assuming that there was inclination on the part of those to leave their homes and come to this our country in such legions of numbers as seems to be the expressed fear—I am compelled here in the exercise of prudence, nevertheless on secure reflection, to recognize the country in which these people live. Will these governments sit idly by and allow the soldier to leave the field and flee his country and leave it barren and desolate? I can not assume it. There are too many methods readily arising to the mind of man, however lightly skilled in statesmanship, for him to overlook that there will be methods found by which these individuals and citizens will not be allowed to leave those countries, and that there will be such embargo and embarrassment, or rather barrier, that we need not fear even if the inhabitants had hoped to come.

Now, Mr. President, I invite your attention to the other danger of the measure. It is provided that this shall be a test. Senators, if the real purpose is to limit immigration, why not do it? If there are dangers upon the country by the multiplication of foreign citizens, why not announce it? If the time has come when an embargo shall be put upon them for any reason for our self-preservation, why not do it? Why adopt a method which on its face is a ruse and will fail of its object, is covered with hypocrisy—in all phases a pretense—and carries with it neither the suggestion of statesmanship on the one hand nor American courage on the other?

If there are dangers menacing this country from immigration sufficient that we should adopt a plan by which it should be limited, let us announce to the country where these dangers lie, set them forth specifically, give the reasons, and announce the remedy as an embargo either absolute or for a limited time, and go to the country with the justification of the action. But this ruse, which will be regarded by our fellow citizens as a pretense, will serve neither to satisfy those who wish to stop immigration nor limit it, and will greatly offend and wound those who feel it is addressed against them, their blood, and their household.

He shall read to the "satisfaction." Well, let us contemplate. I may be pardoned if I indulge in the speculation of a prospect. I will assume that a Democratic national administration is in power and that it is understood that the Bohemian and the Pole, coming from countries standing for principles against the kingdoms and empires, for which a democracy is supposed to be spokesman, offer themselves for entrance at Castle Garden. Those officials are Democrats, we will say. Do you think they will be exercising a very high degree of caution as to the extent that they mean to be satisfied as to whether those whom they feel would make Democrats can read, and are you not quite content that any degree of reading, quite slight, might satisfy those particular gentlemen? If you assume that that much might happen, as you know it has happened in cases I shall illustrate in a moment, you realize, therefore, that the expression "to the satisfaction of these individuals" only gives to this particular administrative court a form of discretion to wholly avoid the provision, or they will comply with it in such a reckless manner as to have it amount to absolutely nothing whatever, as an embargo or limitation.

Now I will assume that our honorable opponents are in power and it is those who come from the northern countries, from the Germanic Provinces, where it is assumed that they are inclined more to a centralized form of government than to a republic. Will my honorable opponents on the other side doubt for a minute that the same human nature on the part of their commissioner will be that which has been evidenced and evinced by mine; that as to these northern nationalities who are making their way to those States that are distinctively Republican, or which he fancies will be done, knowing that inclination of the past, will not find it most agreeable to be quite satisfied with any kind of representation of reading, knowing that politically they will contribute a great deal so soon as naturalized?

Again, will any one of these commissioners hesitate to grant every form of latitude rather than offend the particular element of nationality the same as these applicants, wherever they are, who are voters already, and thus run the risk of having themselves left in disfavor by their party leaders—those responsible for their appointment? We are human; we know that human nature is strong for self-preservation and that such would be the result.

My distinguished friend from Mississippi, the senior Senator [Mr. WILLIAMS], the other day, in an address for this bill, called attention to the fact that he would, if left to himself, be glad to advise more States to adopt something of an educational qualification for voting, such as he said Mississippi and Massachusetts have for the exercise of the suffrage; but I am sure he, and likewise the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LOBGE], will agree with me that where it ever comes to test these qualifications for the right to vote those in charge of the ballot box or of the political machinery have found it ever agreeable to see that these are always quite competent whenever their nature or vote is gathered and comprehended or understood. We do know that in the great cities of our country these forms and qualifications are always overlooked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I very much dislike to interrupt the Senator from Illinois, but—

Mr. LEWIS. I am glad to have my astute and classical friend from Mississippi interrupt me, because I know he contributes information whenever he speaks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Your friend from Mississippi is classical enough, but not always astute.

What the Senator from Illinois a moment ago said, or hardly said, but interrogatively asserted, is so unjust to the State of Mississippi and to all of her authorities that I would feel false to the State if I kept silent. There has never been a charge made by anybody worthy of anybody's credence at any time that in the execution of the laws of the State of Mississippi, in so far as determining whether or not a man could read or write, there has been any bias in making the determination. Furthermore, it would be impossible for there to be. A man must step up and sign his name, write the name of the precinct, and other things. The very fact that he can do so proves that he can read and write.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I am too much inclined toward great affection to the State of Mississippi, to her very great statesmen, and to my distinguished friend who so honorably represents her, not to concede at once that whatever errors or vices or offenses might apply to any other State in the Union, of course are exempt from Mississippi; but the thing I do allude to, and that which I must insist upon, is that wherever you create a principle and make it an object or compensation to the individual who has discretion, to enforce, as under this bill, to say when it may be and how, he will protect his object—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with that, nor am I disputing the argument made by the Senator from Illinois, because I do not care to do it at this moment. It might be very easily disputed. But the Senator from Illinois dragged Mississippi's name into the controversy, though the Mississippi law does not provide that the man shall read satisfactorily to anybody. It simply provides that he shall read and write; he simply has to prove that he can read and write, not satisfactorily, but that he can read and write. I again repeat that the bitterest enemy of Mississippi has never asserted that in carrying out that law there has been any fraud or any unfairness or any prostitution of it for political purposes.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi says that he does not rise at this time to dispute this premise of mine, but that it can be very easily disputed, indicating that what is easy to be done he can do. That I readily confess; but I say to my able friend from Mississippi that it might be true that in the case of Mississippi there is no law requiring one to read to the satisfaction of anyone else or to have these qualifications to the satisfaction of anyone else; but I ask of my friend: Is it not true that if it could be so regulated that every white man in Mississippi could vote without regard to whether or not he could read or write it would be allowed if by the same provision the negro, or the objectionable negro, could have been denied the right to vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reply to the change of base just made by the Senator from Illinois—to which I can compare nothing in all history except McClellan's change of base in front of Richmond—I confess that his last interrogative assertion is perfectly well taken. If Mississippi could have permitted all white

men to vote, regardless of their illiteracy, and could under the Constitution of the United States have disfranchised all negroes, in perfect frankness I say she would have done it; the Senator knows that as well as do I; but the point which the Senator previously made was a different one altogether. He asserted, or interrogatively asserted, that when we did fix a literacy test we have not fairly applied it, and that I deny.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, my distinguished friend says that I have changed my base, and likens the change to what he says is the only similar instance in history, which is the change of base of McClellan before Richmond. I do not know whether my learned friend likens me to McClellan; I would, of course, be complimented by that likeness; or whether he likens himself to Richmond. If to Richmond, I know he means the Duke of Richmond, who was supposed to be a most eminent swordsman; and, of course, conscious of his capacity in that respect, I would not change my base to be in front of such an antagonist; but I say to my friend, I take his answer, that it is true that Mississippi would allow every white man to vote if she could, without regard to whether or not he was able to read or write; therefore the able Senator answers my indictment that there is no literacy test in Mississippi, that it is a test against the negro, not literacy, but to provide a method by which the black can not vote; and in order to prevent that, some whites, of course, come within the same category.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois pardon me a moment?

Mr. LEWIS. I am glad to have my friend interpolate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator says because there was something that Mississippi would have liked to have done and could not, and therefore did not try to do, that therefore the thing which Mississippi did does not exist; he says that because Mississippi would have liked to have admitted all white men to the ballot and to have excluded all negroes, and because under the Constitution of the United States she could not do it, and because she resorted to a literacy test to approximately reach the same result, therefore she has no literacy test. The Senator might just as well say that because a man was sick and needed quinine and could not get it and therefore took something else, he did not take the other thing at all or that he never saw it. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Occupants of the galleries are the guests of the Senate, and it is a violation of the rules of the Senate for them to express either approval or disapproval of any of the proceedings in the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it was only a matter of time, I knew, when my able friend would conclude his interpolation by something bitter—in this instance by an illustration of quinine. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. The medicine is bitter enough.

Mr. LEWIS. But I must say I accept the premise, and assert that if a man wished to take quinine and took something else, I would still insist that he had not taken quinine; I accept the proposition. I also say that if Mississippi has prescribed a test which she calls a literacy test for the purpose of voting, and that her object was merely to prohibit the negro from voting, that she was not prescribing a literacy test as a qualification of voting, but was merely prescribing a method that could be an embargo upon some; and having adopted this as that refuge she could accomplish that object, and that the principle behind it was not to prescribe a literacy test as a condition precedent to the right of a human being to vote, because she would have gladly given every white man the right to vote without regard to whether or not he could read or write if she could have done so consistently without allowing the ignorant negro likewise to vote—therefore having had that offered from so eminent a source as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I accept it.

Mr. President, I now proceed to point out what I said was the danger—and I know my friend will concur—with the provision of this bill vesting the discretion as to whether a person shall read to the satisfaction of somebody. That really does not prescribe any specific limitation upon the entrance of any person into this country, nor does it prescribe specifically any specific condition which prohibits in itself specifically by a rule of action or by law any class of people. Therefore, it is a ruse; to me it is a deception. It is one which could be practical, as I see it, in a manner that would work latitudes of favor in one direction and of favoritism or discriminating favoritism in another.

Mr. President, I have the second point to urge, which I beg my learned friends, as we are speaking in this matter as in a conversation, to contemplate with me. I could not give my approval to a principle which makes the test of education the right to enter into this country without conceding that there

was inherently in the country the right to make education the test of deporting a man out of the country; for the very moment we concede that principle in this Government we break down every ideal, shatter every foundation, and destroy the theory upon which we are founded for the preservation of liberty and the advancement of freedom to man. Sir, after that, that before a man can enjoy the principles on which this Government was founded we should have a form of educational qualification, the very next step must be that no man then would have a right to remain in the country who has already come in unless he likewise has the same qualification; and there will be a clamor at the door of the Capitol on the part of the very same influences that are seeking to inscribe this particular qualification in the law to deport all those already in the country if they likewise are not within the privileges of this exemption. Therefore I fear the introduction of this innovation; I fear the precedent it establishes.

Once, Mr. President, as I have said, you start upon this course there is no point at which you can stop, for the very next step will be, as intimated by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the able chairman from South Carolina, and my very distinguished and always alert friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that there will arise in the minds of our countrymen the qualification of education for suffrage. We will have established it for entrance into the country, and we will then have established it as a qualification for remaining in the country; and then will arise that other demand that a man shall have a form of education before he shall vote; and the moment that is established, following this precedent, then we will have that other, which will follow fast upon its heels, that men shall sit in judgment as to whether a particular individual is educated sufficiently to cast a vote at a particular election, and that will turn upon the particular politics of that particular machinery.

I fear, therefore, Mr. President, the introduction of this innovation. I fear the future, and I say to the laboring man, I say to their eminent labor leaders, for whose sincerity we have great respect, for whose character we vouch with great confidence, that if it shall ever be successfully urged in this country that a man shall have to undergo an educational test to enter into this country the very opponents and persecuting tyrants of the toilers of this country will be found banding together to impose an educational qualification upon their right to vote. This upon the theory that that qualification can be so manipulated as to cut the great majority of the votes of the poor out of the participation in the political contests of this Republic. I, therefore, for that reason can not give my approval to the precedent that I fear is being established upon the part of the proponents of this measure.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator passes to another subject—

Mr. LEWIS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should have asked the question which I am about to ask a moment ago. The Senator has said several times that this bill provides that the immigrant must be able to read to the satisfaction of some official. Where does the Senator find that provision in the bill?

Mr. LEWIS. I ask my able friend who shall decide whether the immigrant can read? Somebody must decide.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator, however, said that the immigrant must read to the satisfaction of some one; which would imply, as I understand him, that the examining official could exclude him upon the ground that he did not read as well as the examining official thought he ought to read.

Mr. LEWIS. To which I answer, yes. The examining official would have a right to say, under this provision, as I see it, that the reading was not reading according to his judgment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not so read the bill. It seems to me that the bill lays down about as definite a test as could well be laid down in that kind of a case.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the Senator kindly read the paragraph in section 3.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The provision is as follows:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

Those are the classes of people to be excluded. Then there is a certain proviso which does not apply until you come down to the nineteenth line on page 8, and that provision reads:

That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in some one of the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or

dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect.

If the immigrant reads the words printed upon that slip, as I understand there is no discretion vested in the inspector, he must admit the immigrant; and if he fails to read them, then he must be excluded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I suspect that the Senator from Illinois has obtained his impression as to the meaning of the bill by the provision on page 9, where the proposed amendment is to be inserted, which reads:

That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they emigrated from the country of which they were last permanent residents solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is an entirely different matter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that is where the Senator from Illinois got his idea. In that provision are found the words "prove to the satisfaction," and so forth; but under the literacy test as provided in this bill the question of admission is absolutely in the hands of the immigrant himself; all he has to do is to read a certain number of printed words, and if he does, he is entitled to admission.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. According to my understanding, that is the end of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is no limitation whatever.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If he reads the slip, he is admitted; while if he fails to read it, he is excluded.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I thank my able friends, but I do not misapprehend the provision at all. I may be in error as to my conclusions; that is a mere difference of opinion; but I most respectfully urge upon my learned colleagues that the bill provides that an officer—I have called him a "commissioner," because the head officer is the commissioner, but I should refer to the others as underofficers; and in that respect only is my nomenclature inaccurate—the bill provides that an inspector shall hand the immigrant a slip containing printed words in some prescribed language, and the immigrant shall read to the inspector. Therefore the law creates the inspector the judge as to whether the immigrant is reading sufficiently well, and vests in his sole discretion the judgment as to whether the immigrant reads with sufficient intelligence and knowledge as to characterize his performance as reading within the meaning of the law as that inspector sees it. Does my able friend from Utah deny that that is his privilege?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear from the provisions of this bill that the sole test is whether the immigrant is able to read the slip which is presented to him. The question as to whether or not he reads it well or reads it ill does not enter into the matter at all. The Senator from Illinois would read very much better than I would read, and yet if we two presented ourselves to the inspector I do not understand, if we could both read the slip, that the Senator from Illinois would be admitted because he read it better than I read it and that I would be excluded because I did not read it so well. It is a simple test as to whether or not the slip can be read, and if it is read, then the immigrant is entitled to admission.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, I will give to my friend a simple illustration. A child is 4 or 5 years of age. The affectionate mother has begun to teach it its letters, and the child with a few letters brought together may be able to recognize and spell the word "dog" or "cat," and yet it could be clearly and truthfully said that the child could not read, although the child might be able to designate those one or two terms. So the immigrant inspector has to decide in his own judgment whether the method of procedure, the final pronunciation, and the final discharge of the undertaking amounts to a reading. I am sure if that be not in his power there would be no power in him at all, because otherwise you would leave it to the applicant himself to be the sole judge as to whether he could read. Somebody must decide as to whether he has complied with the reading test, and therefore I am merely calling attention to the fact that that very discretion offers such room for abuse, as I see it, and the provision is likely to receive such administration as will make of it an instrumentality of persecution or a farce, and even if it did not, I maintain that no such qualification would serve either the purpose of preventing bad men or unworthy men from coming into the country or putting a limitation upon immigration to avoid any evils, if such evils exist, from the influx of immigration.

Why, sir, would it be but a ruse? I see sitting around me Senators who will recall the history of certain contract-labor

laws, and, without reviving it to their minds by reading them dreary excerpts from the books, how well do they remember that hordes of individuals, in numbers, schools, classes, circles, and communities, were all prepared as to certain forms of interrogatories and certain forms of answers by which the law was violated wholesale through these instrumentalities. Supposing that these particular slips are prepared and the slips are in the hands of the immigration inspectors, is it not perfectly clear to us all that it is only a matter of time when every one of these slips will be known, after having been presented to the first few hundred immigrants, to the other few thousand? They will all be known; the words used would be relatively few. The trick of having the immigrants educated to just that exact extent is so apparent that, far from serving the purposes for which it is designed, my distinguished colleagues, it will offer an opportunity for abuses by making liars of the people who come in, common tricksters of those who desire them to come in, and the perpetrators of fraud on the part of those who administer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS. Gladly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator think that the law requires that the same slips shall be submitted every day?

Mr. LEWIS. No; I say to my friend that it would not be so, and that is why I remark that after a great number of times they would have to be duplicated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the same slips were used they could be memorized, but if different slips were submitted on different days they could not be memorized.

Mr. LEWIS. If different slips were offered on different days it would only be a matter of time when a certain number of slips would be well known and a certain number of words well understood, because the number of words that would be used would be relatively limited, and it would only be a matter of time when enough knowledge could be communicated to those at home by those who had arrived to serve the purpose of the ruse and work a deception upon the whole system.

I am afraid my able friend from Mississippi misapprehends my purpose. It is this: To demonstrate that the number of people that it might really keep out in its final and legitimate application would be so small that it would really work no benefit against evil, if evil there exists in this country, nor would it avoid the repetition or multiplication of that evil if such is now threatened from foreign shores.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was about to suggest to the Senator, in line with what the Senator from Mississippi has suggested, that this matter is entirely in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. He is to prescribe the slips, and it is not to be supposed for one moment that he will use the same slip over and over again or even a limited number of slips over and over again. Having the administration of this law in his responsibility, he would undoubtedly try to make it effective, and he would prescribe slips of an indefinite and unlimited variety so that there would be no duplication one day after another.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There could be a new slip every day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; there could be a new one every day.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, may I ask the Senator from Utah to hearken to me a moment? The Senator from Utah will now see the application of my previous strictures. Upon that theory the Senator from Utah will see that the inspectors might fear that those who had arrived had communicated some of the contents of their slips to those who were coming, and therefore to prevent them from having the benefit of that memorization he would insist on the immigrant being able to read every word upon the slip, and should he fail in some one word the inspector would assume that the immigrant read only from memorization of the few words that had been communicated to him from previous slips, and under the discretion vested in him he could declare that the immigrant does not read sufficiently well. At once it will be seen that there is room for a trap or for a trick or for deception.

Discretion would be to a great degree exercised in order to avoid the very thing that I say is possible in the memorization of these slips. The inspector would have to go to the very extreme in order to avoid it. Learned Senators will see, I am sure, what I mean. It is not that I am criticizing the bill for this provision. I recognize how very difficult it is to make any provision that would serve your purposes. I am pointing out that this particular provision, as you may readily see, does

not serve the purpose, if the purpose is to keep out of this country objectionable people, who, because of their numbers, would be ill or evil to our Nation. This particular form of embargo accomplishes no result, produces no remedy, and relieves us from no misfortune.

Mr. President, I want to call attention, as I proceed with this discussion, to some plain facts. I call attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. I recall that the history of this whole legislation discloses that the Senator from Vermont, as chairman of this committee in the preceding Senate, had occasion to make a number of reports. In his very able presentation on yesterday we discover that the Senator's remarks include, first, the commission of 1882, which made representations to the country setting forth the class of immigration that was undesirable. But the commission of 1907, by a strange turn in the wheel of possibilities, appears to recommend as wholly available those who in 1882 were denounced, and finds a new order in 1907 as the objectionable ones.

The Senator from Vermont produces a table, which I dare say can not be disputed, which discloses that in the one census taken at the time of the first immigration 14 per cent of these individuals could not read, but immediately following, in the very next census, only 3 per cent of the same. This shows you very clearly, my brother Senators, that after arriving in the country they had been here but a short while when their illiteracy very largely decreased, and they became sufficiently learned to be placed in the category of the learned of our citizenship. Moreover, any elements of objection which had prevailed at the time of the commission of 1882 had been wholly removed, or so largely that in 1907 those who were the subjects of denunciation in the first report were the objects of commendation in the second. So it is clear that the standards which we assume to adopt at this time may be equally obsolete and equally inequitable and unjust 10 years from to-day, or 5 years, as the one thus created in the short hiatus disclosed by the speech of the able Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, the city that I represent, speaking personally—as I live in Chicago and my able colleague lives in another portion of the State—has a very large foreign-born population. It may interest you to know that there is not a nationality that is known that has not some representation in the splendid city whence I come. The people of these nationalities feel greatly aggrieved that a committee of this body recommends that their families and their kinsmen shall be eliminated from the enjoyment of the liberty of this Nation, and particularly that it is proposed that they shall be eliminated, prohibited, and forbidden upon reports in which they were allowed no opportunity of hearing. They say that their nationalities had no representation; that they were given no chance to present the real knowledge that could have been given; and they propound the query to us: When has any commission from this country gone abroad to study the real class of people, as they live and exist, who should or should not be admitted into our country? What qualifications would you say you possessed to prescribe who should be admitted from any knowledge you have of these people, the land in which they live, the distresses which they suffer, the despotism which they endure, the persecution which afflicts them? They call to your attention the fact that you sit in solemn chamber here at Washington, you hear a few individuals, and from these individuals, numbering no more than the fingers upon your hand, you make a computation of the millions which represent their blood and brawn, their life and character, their achievement and sacrifice, their nobility and suffering, their life and death; and they inveigh against the injustice of it as they see it. They feel that this honorable body has not qualified itself to pass judgment upon them, their generation, and their time.

Mr. President, I must insist that there is one test that it is well for us to undertake. It is the test of the character of the individual. I would it were in my power to devise at once and spontaneously and recommend to my colleagues some prescription and standard by which to test the character and fitness as human beings of those who come to enjoy the liberties of our Nation, my reason being that no man has a right in this Nation who does not come with the idea of respecting its institutions, revering its sacred traditions, living for its glory, and dying for its perpetuation, if need be. If a man, whoever he is, by his associations in the place from whence he came, by his life and habits, is so situated that clearly, upon analysis of the man, he is unfit to enjoy the privileges of this Nation because of the danger he threatens, the things he menaces, such a one should be prohibited. But, Mr. President, I am not able to concede that the mere fact that a man can not read is a standard by which such could be judged.

Here sits my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], to whom I pay the compliment, without qualification, of being one of the learned scholars of our body. His writings, his lectures, his eminence in many directions testify to that. He referred to McClellan in a gentle passage between ourselves—a very eminent soldier. Since his knowledge of martial matters, I know, is equally good in all respects, I invite his attention to one of the most remarkable cavalry officers the world has recorded—Murat; Murat of Napoleon's campaigns; so magnificent an officer that he was the only man from whom the great Stonewall Jackson of this country seemed to feel justified in taking a lesson, and yet Murat was once a waiter in a restaurant, unable to read the slip to let the man know how much he owed when he wished to collect the bill of the public house.

My learned friend will recall that the barons of Runnymede, who laid the charter of the liberties of our country, not only could not read, but the king to whom they made their approach made his only sign by the hilt of a halberd. Surely these, to whom we appeal as the sources of our inspiration, the very monuments of our renowned civilization, could not have been such if the mere test of reading and writing could have been applied to test their manhood or patriotism.

The able Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] gave us a catalogue of the number of people who have come into our country and by their splendid performance of citizenship have commended themselves to our admiration and left behind them the record of their glorious deeds who in the beginning could not read. Therefore I am not able to accept the idea that the mere matter of reading can be the test of the soul. I can not accept the idea that reading is the test of the worth of life. I can not accept the idea that mere reading will make a law-abiding citizen. To the contrary, I must insist that many men who have committed offenses in this country against our laws—and who ought to be, if they could be, taken from out of our country because of their deliberate, impudent defiance of our institutions—were those the most learned—learned in craft, learned in the skill of disobedience, learned and equipped in all the methods by which they might violate the law and escape the penalty. Therefore I must respectfully urge that the real test of citizenship in this country—the right to enjoy the liberty and freedom of this country—should rather turn upon something else than this which is prescribed under this bill.

Mr. President, I have now manifested very clearly my objections to the fundamental phases of this proposed legislation. I heard my learned friend from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], and the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] enter into some disputation as to the class of people who were supposed to be the objects of this bill, to the effect that they crowded into the cities—that they did not till the farms.

Mr. President, it may be true that the citizens from the northern European countries have gone to the farms in greater number than those from the south; but, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that that does not apply solely to the foreigner. Our cities are congested with American-born citizens. They are congested with people who come from our own little country towns. The cities are congested because of the allurements of the city to the individual, not because he is a foreigner. The reason why the farms are not occupied by these people from foreign countries as well as from our own is not because they might not prefer the farm, but because our Government has offered no inducement calling for the humble individual from abroad to go to the farms. It offers him no encouragement; nor does it offer such to any American crowded in our cities. Our country offers him the barren land; sends him empty handed to the naked soil, to the bleak winds, the frosty mornings, the cold and chilling nights. He is without a dollar, without a cent. He must enter upon that land. No provision is made to give him the implements by which he may undertake farming. There is nothing to give him a home in which he may be sheltered, no provision to induce him to remain on the farm by which he might stay there and provide a living for himself, habitation for his family, or cultivation of the soil. If conditions were changed and our Government turned itself about to make some slight provision for these people in order to encourage the settlement of the farms, the criticism of the able Senators that these people flock to the cities instead of the country, I am sure, would not have applied. Therefore we see very clearly that the real reason they are in the cities and not on the farms is not because of preference but because of conditions.

Mr. President, this provision of the pending bill, so far as I am concerned, wars against every principle of the Democracy. I am unable to see, from my point of view, how the spirit of Democracy, which is supposed to open wide its arms, to extend

them to all the oppressed, can say: "Yes, unless your oppression has been so great that you have not even had the opportunity of learning how to read. If so, you can not come in. If your oppression has been so great that you have been oppressed to the degree that you could not even have the opportunity of a schooling by which you could learn of the reasons of your wrongs or where you may get your rights, you shall not come in. We tell you that your oppression has been too great, and for that reason you are not to have the benefits and privileges of this land of liberty and this asylum of freedom." What form of exception is this that you can dare to justify before the great heart of the Democracy of this country?

This provision wars, as I see it, against the spirit of Republicanism, which is to open the gates of this Republic to those who cry for freedom and liberty, to those who deserve it because of their manhood, their character, their life—they who show by their existence obedience to the laws of man and reverence for their responsibility to God. If there shall come a time when the mere presence of immigrants shall menace our country in other directions, then we can address ourselves to it by giving the reasons, and then, upon these reasons, act openly, nobly, frankly, and trust to the good sense of our Republic to justify our course. But, as I see it, this device works a fraud. This ruse works a deception. This pretense gives no relief, and inflicts the Democracy, for which I assume to speak, and the spirit of Republicanism with an outrage and a wrong.

Senators, as I view it, you can not pass this bill and any longer hold us up before the country as representing the spirit that gives refuge and asylum to oppression. If you pass this bill, your next duty is clear to my mind—that we immediately pass an act that shall have for its purpose the tearing down of the statue that is at the gate of New York as we enter into this Republic the endowment of Bartholdi, a Frenchman of German extraction, and that we cast it into the sea. In its place, instead of an inviting figure with its arms extended, with Liberty enlightening the world, inviting all the oppressed to find asylum and refuge here, let us change its aspect. Instead of those kindly eyes looking out over the seas with welcome, let us insert as eyes fireballs that glare and blaze defiance and threat. Instead of the extended right hand opening its palm and welcoming these people as friends, let it clutch a weapon that threatens to strike to death their dreams. Instead of the kindly, smiling lips that it presents, welcome and gracious invitation to all those who are oppressed to come, let us put upon those lips scorn at misery, sneer at oppression, and inscribe as the motto on its brow, "Let no one hope to enter here. To those who are oppressed let them beware! The more oppressed you are, the less hope you have in this Nation. The more has been your oppression, which has added to your misfortunes at home, the more we will continue you where your misfortunes may increase, your misery multiply." Let us dethrone the statue, cast it into the sea, and a truth this measure speaks—warning such as Dante saw over the gates of the inferno—that "they who *would* enter here leave all hope behind."

Senators, I tender my motion to strike out this section, because, as I view it, it is un-American, un-Democratic, un-Republican, and visits an injustice and an outrage upon the spirit of freedom of this the American Republic.

Mr. LEWIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire, as a portion of my remarks, to introduce an article from Current Opinion, being an extract from Edward A. Steiner's story, "From alien to citizen." It is only a page and a half. If I may introduce that in my remarks at an appropriate point, I should be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the request will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT THAT OVERCOMES RACE PREJUDICES.

At a time when the revival of so-called racial animosities appals the world an American may experience another kind of thrill by reading Edward A. Steiner's story of his life in America, "From Alien to Citizen." In its spirit and in its record of personal experience the book is a document of extraordinary "human interest." Prof. Steiner's delight in relating an incident of his clerical life of the minister of public instruction of Hungary in Chicago is typical. They had been watching a social-settlement basketball game over which his excellency became enthusiastic. "Of course, these young men are native Americans," he commented. With perfect assurance, Prof. Steiner replied: "There is not a native American among them. The losing team is made up of Slavs from the Stock Yards district, and the winners are Jews from the neighborhood of Twelfth and Halstead Streets." To prove it, Prof. Steiner called one of the players, asked his name and birthplace, and said, "Now, my boy, I want you to meet his excellency the minister of public instruction of your own country." Prof. Steiner continues:

"With perfect democratic dignity, the boy shook 'his excellency's' reluctant hand, saying heartily: 'I am glad to meet you, Minister. How do you like Chicago?'"

"It took 'his excellency' some minutes to recover from the shock. Then he said to me in tragic tones: 'It is impossible! This boy belongs to the lowest of our subject races. We have ruled them for 900 years, but have not really conquered them. We have forced our language upon them and they have refused to speak it. We have forbidden the use of their mother tongue in the higher schools, yet they never forget it, and with each year they become more and more Slavonic. You take our refuse, our lowest classes, and in a generation you make Americans of them. How do you do it?'"

Prof. Steiner grew up among Slovak boys and left his Jewish mother in Hungary to come in the steerage to America. His story shows intimately the forces which are at work, both for good and evil, upon the immigrant—the sweat shop, the mills and mines, with their grinding labor; the lower courts, the jail, the open road, with its dangers; the American home, the college, and the Christian Church. He now occupies the chair of applied Christianity at Grinnell College, Iowa, and has become most widely known for his personal and public work for immigrants. "I have tried," he says, "to humanize the process of admission to this country, to expose and abolish the worst abuses of the steerage, and to interpret the quality and character of the new immigrant to those Americans who became hysterical from fear and believed that these newer people were less than human."

"Upon the vast army of workers who free us from hard and dangerous toil we must look with the respect due to their calling. The man who goes into the depths of the mine and exchanges his day for night, that we may change the night into day; the man who faces the boiling caldron and draws ribbons of fire from the furnace for our safety and comfort; the man, the woman, and the child who have bent their backs to stitch our clothes, have not only justified their existence but have made ours easier, more beautiful, and safer. That they are Hungarians, Italians, or Jews ought to make no difference, for, after all, they are human."

Against holding the immigrant responsible for every supposed evil to which society is heir, Prof. Steiner has stood out. If he is optimistic regarding the future, he says it is because he knows from actual experience that the newer immigrant is just as worthy as those who preceded him.

"I have shared his economic burdens for many years and have seen him lifting himself and his family to a new and higher level. I have watched him develop his downtrodden strength and his hidden talents. I have also sounded the note of warning, for I have known him to become more and more the victim of our industrial maladjustment, suffering anew from overstrain, accidents, and occupational diseases."

"Over and over again I have traveled the 'trail of the immigrant,' from shop to mill, from farm to mine, and back again. I have retraced my steps to the villages and towns of the Old World, and have repeatedly gone over the selfsame path which once I traveled from sheer necessity. I have joined my life to thousands and tens of thousands of these strangers. I have helped to create groups of faithful workers and have endeavored to fill them with the prime requisite for their task—an effective sympathy."

"I have touched in the great throngs the men and women who voluntarily or perforce have become the neighbors of these aliens, and they have justified my faith. I have not yet heard an ill word spoken of them by those who know them best. Their detractors always live at a distance."

Climate, quality and quantity of food, economic opportunity, a good wage are important environmental influences. But Prof. Steiner's plea is for the strengthening of the one power which he has found most active in shaping and reshaping not only his own life but the lives of others—"the spirit of democracy, which basically is supreme confidence in man."

The generations which are to follow as a result of race mixtures here, Prof. Steiner thinks, "will be an American type in whose shaping environment will play a larger part than inherited race qualities."

"We are told by a certain professor whose genius in generalizing is unquestioned that we shall become a mongrel race and lose all those qualities which have made us virile, intelligent, and resourceful."

"Others tell us that we shall become a superrace, inheriting the virtues of all these people who mingle with us; that we shall surpass every other nation in strength and talents."

"I am frank to say that I do not know what will happen. The effects of intermarriage are imperfectly understood, and we have no reliable data; but I am not a believer in the immutability of race. I stand between Chamberlain's 'Rasse ist Alles' and Finot's 'Rasse ist Nichts'—race is everything, and race is nothing. My own observation has led me to believe that nothing serious happens when a child has in its veins a mixture of Latin and Saxon blood, and that Slavic and Semite mixtures, and others, too, have produced normal children."

It was in the Lower Town Church, in a large city of the Northwest, situated between huge terminal railroad yards, that Dr. Steiner changed the text of his preaching from "People, be good" to "People, be good to one another." There was a cosmopolitan congregation of wage earners, he tells us, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, and real Irish; Germans, English, and French; Swedes and Norwegians, one happy Italian, and a few Americans. The children were mixtures of many races, and they constituted splendid new stock to quicken the life of the Nation:

"In Lower Town I saw the supreme test of the church accomplished. A vital unity was created among people of different races and tongues. They were bound together into a new blood kinship which is wider than tribe or nation or race, and they were a new people, one in Christ Jesus."

"There for the first time I came in touch with the 'Melting Pot.' It was not a chafing dish with an alcohol lamp under it, as many, forming their conception of it from Mr. Zangwill's rather mild drama, imagined it to be; it was a real, seething caldron, with its age-old fires of hate and prejudice threatening to consume its contents. Then came the torrent of love, with its mighty power, putting out the old fire by kindling a new one."

"There in Lower Town my neighbor, an old Jewish rag man, came and asked me to 'commit a matrimony' by marrying his niece to as typical an Irishman as I have ever seen. There, too, I baptized the baby born of that Irish-Jewish parentage."

"The relatives on both sides claimed the privilege of selecting its name, and decided on Patrick and Moses, respectively. A conflict seeming imminent as I stood ready to perform the sacred rite, I interposed, and with one syllable from each name, baptized the child Patmos, which satisfied both factions."

"This boy Patmos," adds Prof. Steiner, "became rather symbolic of all my ministry, for it has been my supreme effort to reconcile old divisions, blot out old hates, and bring into kinship those who have been afar off. It would be too great presumption to believe that I have always succeeded; but to feel that I have tried, that I am still

trying, and have not lost faith, that it shall ultimately be accomplished is something in which to glory."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise now not for the purpose of making any extended remarks, nor for the purpose of making any argument upon this subject, but, in the interest of historical accuracy, to correct a mistake made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

He referred to Murat as having been "a waiter in a restaurant," who "could not read the tickets which were brought to him with the meal charges." So far from this being the case, Mr. President, Murat had been a student of theology and was educated for the priesthood. Murat was never, so far as I know—though, among his varied experiences that may have been one, however—a waiter in a restaurant at all. He was the son of an innkeeper, and from that fact, perhaps, the Senator from Illinois got his idea.

If the Senator will turn to the Century Cyclopedia of Names, he will find the following (italics mine):

Murat, Joachim. Born at Bastide, Lot, France, March 25, 1771; executed at Pizzo, Calabria, Italy, October 13, 1815. A French marshal, and King of Naples, brother-in-law of Napoleon I.; famous as a cavalry commander. He was the son of an innkeeper; studied theology at Toulouse; entered the army as a volunteer, and served with distinction in Italy, 1796-97, and in Egypt, 1798-99, becoming a general of division—

And so on.

Mr. LEWIS. Pardon me; my distinguished friend forgets that he was taken up after being a waiter, his education paid for, and given inclination to the clergy. Friends took him and sent him to college; but he was a waiter in his father's place and could not even read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois, in illustration of his point, quoted Murat as the instance of a very distinguished man, who had had a very distinguished career, who could not read.

Mr. LEWIS. He began his life—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, there was a time in his life when he could not read, of course, and a time in mine when I could not read. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator referred to him as an instance of a man who had done very distinguished things and achieved very great things, notwithstanding that he could not read; and said that he was "a waiter in a restaurant"—not that he helped to serve guests in his father's inn at times—and that he could not read the meal checks that were brought to him, from which the inference was left upon the minds of the Senate that this great cavalry leader performed all of his great achievements without the advantage of being able to read the general orders of his commander in chief, even.

Now, I will go a little bit further.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi further yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In one moment I will yield again to the Senator; but I want this to come along regularly.

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; but I must beg the Senator not to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield for the present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at this moment. I will yield in a second.

If the Senator will turn again to the Encyclopædia Britannica he will find, under the head "Murat," the following:

Murat, Joachim (1767-1815). King of Naples, younger son of an innkeeper at La Bastide-Fortunière in the Department of Lot, France, was born on the 25th of March, 1767. Destined for the priesthood—

From his very boyhood—

he obtained a bursary at the College of Cahors, proceeding afterwards to the University of Toulouse, where he studied canon law.

That is, ecclesiastical law.

His vocation, however, was certainly not sacerdotal, and after dissipating his money he enlisted in a cavalry regiment. In 1789 he had attained the rank of *marchal des logis*—

And so forth.

Now, this has nothing to do with the debate, Mr. President. I merely called attention to it because, in the interest of historical accuracy, I knew that the Senator did not want to leave behind him a misapprehension. He did not want to leave behind him the notion that this great cavalry commander did all that he did without being able even to read, and if so, not even the general orders of his commander in chief.

That reminds me that during the debate several little mistakes of that sort were made. The other day a distinguished Senator, in paying a tribute to the German race, mentioned Edison as one of the Germans in the United States. Edison's ancestors came to the United States from Holland, not from

Germany; they came here in 1730 and settled in New Jersey in 1730. So he is about as good an American as any of us, because none of us were Americans before we came, of course. [Laughter.] We came from somewhere in order to get here. All the white people did, at any rate. The only real native Americans are the Indians. [Laughter.]

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, no one finds greater consolation than I in the fact that we have in the Senate a gentleman who feels it his privilege to rise and correct what he thinks have been all the errors of all the Senators all the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for the purpose of being insulting. I yielded to the Senator for any question that he might put or any argument that he chose to make. It is absolutely untrue that I have undertaken to correct all the errors of all the Senators at all times, and the Senator knows it. I have corrected one individual error, and a very flagrant one, of this particular Senator.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that no Senator is further from the suggestion of an insult than I. For myself, if anyone intimated that I had the capacity to correct all the Senators in all the errors that were made, I would regard it as a great tribute, not an insult.

I wish to say, however, that the learned Senator has called attention to the after days of Murat, and he has intimated that I sought to intimate that when that officer was a *marchal* he could not read his orders. Nothing of the kind was ever intimated. The Senator found that agreeable to suggest, in order to verify positions he had heretofore taken. Nothing of the kind had been intimated. I used the illustration in connection with those whose origin was very humble who rose to very high stations, who had obtained an education with great difficulty, and coupled the matter with similar instances which had been referred to by the Senator from Missouri.

Now, I will say to my able friend that I may not be so skilled in all the details of all history—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. LEWIS. I would love to make a speech to my able friend if it would be appreciated. I desire to say, if he will pardon me, that I shall place on his desk in a few days, as my colleague, a book I have written on France—not an exceedingly good book, not so learned and capable a book as might be written by many others; but in this book I have devoted a small chapter to this individual, after having given considerable investigation to his character, surroundings, and career. I think the Senator will see from that chapter that the early origin of Murat has been well fortified by footnotes, and that these encyclopedias to which my friend had to take his recourse to find information regarding this distinguished gentleman only referred to the latter days of his life when he reached glory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not referring to the latter days of a man when I quote the authority to the effect that he was "destined for the priesthood," went through a college, and afterwards went through a university. He did that, of course, while he was a boy; not after he became a man.

I do not know what was in the mind of the Senator from Illinois; but I frequently find that there is a disposition to confer all sorts of honor upon ignorance, and that it is very popular to do it. When the Senator made that assertion it did not accord with my recollection of history, and therefore I got these books for the purpose of finding myself wrong or else dissipating that idea as far as I could.

There is generally a disposition, I will not say to make an apotheosis of ignorance—because unfortunately ignorance is not yet dead in this world, and an apotheosis can only come after decease—but to make a eulogy upon it, and to try to prove at all times that many men have been great because they were ignorant. Now, there have been a few men in this world who were great notwithstanding the fact that they were ignorant—some few. It is true that the barons at Runnymede could not sign the Great Charter. It is true that many a king in Europe at that time could not have done it. It is true that for years and years that hardly anybody but the priesthood in all Europe could read, hence the "right of clergy"; but that does not prove anything in modern America or in modern Europe at this time. We are in a different age and must meet a different competition.

There is no excuse for a man with an enterprising mind and with any native intelligence at this hour of the clock in the twentieth century, or at an hour of the clock previous to this in the latter part of the nineteenth century, in either Scandinavia, or Germany, or Holland, or Belgium, or France, or northern Italy, or Scotland, or Ireland, or England, or Wales reaching adult age without being able to read. There is but

one of two reasons in the world to be given for it—either laziness or stupidity.

The school facilities in Germany are better than they are in the United States. The school facilities in Switzerland are better. The school facilities in France, and in Belgium, and in Holland, and England, and Ireland, and Wales are every bit as good; those in Scotland are better. The school facilities in the greater part of Scandinavia, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are better than they are in the United States. All this talk about their not being able to read and write because they are oppressed is not quite accurate.

There are parts of Europe where people can not read and write because no opportunities have been furnished them, or, rather, because sufficient and abundant opportunities have not been furnished; but that, again, is not the point, Mr. President. We are not excluding the individual because of lack of individual honesty or character. As I said the other day, we are not aiming at a person. We are aiming at a thing, and a dangerous thing—ignorance—a thing dangerous to morals, dangerous to civilization, but above all dangerous to free institutions in a country where every featherless biped who reaches 21 years of age can vote. The father of Democracy himself laid down the principle that the perpetuity of this Republic depended "upon the intelligence of its citizens," and when the Cortez of Spain, the Spanish people having arisen against Napoleon and undertaken still later to establish a Republic, enacted an educational franchise, it was Thomas Jefferson who came out in one of the most eloquent letters ever written welcoming it as a step forward in the march of civilization which hitherto no other people had had the sense to make.

You are not oppressing a man because you are keeping him out of America, keeping him from becoming a member of our family politic. Gentlemen talk as if everybody born on the surface of the earth had a God-given right to come here and pretend to be Americans. I do not believe that even my ancestors had a right to come here and take the land from the Indians without paying for it and without their consent. That is going back to sure-enough native Americans.

Of course the word "Americanism" in a certain sense is a mere comparative term. One man's ancestors coming in 1608 and another's in 1730, as Edison's did, another comes 100 years later, and all that, but all of this is wide of this mark, Mr. President. All of it is wide of the salient point, that if we want to take care of the Republic, if we want American traditions and American ideals and American civilization and American free institutions conserved and perpetuated, then we want the foreigner who comes to our shores to be what? First, able, competent, intellectually "fit" to help mold our institutions, to assimilate our traditions, to further our ideals, to improve our institutions.

That is first, and second what? And upon this I, in my thought, am emphatic. We want a man who, when he took his naturalization oath, did not swear to a lie, who, when he said, as a condition of naturalization, that he cast off all allegiance across the water did not keep concealed a mental reservation to king, kaiser, czar, emperor, what not, who did not come here with the idea that it was permissible after he had settled here to regulate his conduct in America as an American citizen by something going on beyond the water. The minute he does that he confesses he committed perjury when he took out his naturalization papers.

If you are going to have a foreign-born man help to mold American institutions, let it be a man who is competent for American citizenship, and, moreover, let it be a man who is willing to be an American citizen, who down in the bottom of his heart means what he says when he takes his naturalization oath, and who does really mean what that oath means, that the sole loyalty he in his heart holds to any government on the surface of this earth is loyalty to the Government of the United States.

As far as I am concerned, and I rather like plain speaking, I do not want anybody else of any other sort. If he has the slightest mental reservation whereby he proposes to mold or control or influence American institutions or politics, in war or peace, in sympathy with some other country's institutions or national ambitions elsewhere, then, even if he can read and write, I do not want him. If he can not read, I do not want him even then. He could not understand and appreciate what his new allegiance means.

I think after we are through with this immigration legislation we ought to go further in connection with our naturalization laws and make a man when he took his naturalization oath swear if a war took place in Europe somewhere between his old country and some other he would still preserve his allegiance

to the American flag and not go across the water in order to serve in the armies of one of the contending parties, and that when it came to a possible mental reservation retaining allegiance to any other power he ought to be made to assert that, to the best of his ability, he would never permit himself as an American citizen in connection with American domestic or international political questions to be influenced by the interests of the country of his nativity.

You may call that narrow if you want to. It may be. All patriotism is narrow to some extent. There will come a day when patriotism will go out of existence, because every man everywhere in a high state of civilization will be a citizen of the world, and he will not stand upon the idea of putting the interests of his own particular country foremost. But we have not reached that age yet, and as long as we have not reached it we want men who *profess* to be American citizens to be Americans. I do not mean by that to be born in America. I do not mean by that to have had a parent born in America; but that they shall love America, that they shall assimilate American traditions, that they shall love American ideals, and that they shall be capable, at any rate, of understanding American institutions.

I go further than that. I can not say with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] that the proposition of not admitting a man to our shores because he has not a certain degree of intelligence carries with it as a corollary the idea of deporting him if he does not. I can not go that far; but I certainly would not arm ignorance, even though already existing in the United States, with a sword which it does not know how to use—the ballot.

The so-called right of suffrage is not a right at all. It is a privilege conferred upon the citizen by society in the interest of society. Little by little it has broadened and grown, covering more and more people, taking in more and more individuals, because little by little competency and fitness and intelligence have broadened and grown. It ought not to broaden and grow one whit more than competence and intelligence do. You can not confer a worse curse upon any community in the world than the much-vaunted American "universal suffrage" if a majority of the people in any section or community armed with the ballot are incapable of exercising the ballot intelligently. You had better have an intelligent king. You had better have anything than that.

But I did not rise to make a speech. I had no idea of doing it. I merely rose to correct some errors, and these errors I rose to correct not because they are important in themselves, but merely because they are indications of the readiness with which the human mind conceives the idea and loves to conceive the idea that the miraculous has happened, that a particular lame man without hands can write with his toes, that a particular man without the capacity of reading still shows great intelligence on some subject.

This tendency is general.

There was another great cavalry leader during our own war. I believe half the people of the United States believe that Bedford Forrest could not read and could not write. He could not write very well, but he read very well, and he was by no means a general all-around ignoramus. He was not a college man, but he had a satisfactory "old field-schoolhouse" training—not a bad one, by the way. The stories that are told about him, with all sorts of nigger language put into his mouth, are not true. I happened to know him myself. Gen. Forrest spoke very good English when he wanted to. People love to believe these things just for the same reason that they love to be told stories about a blind man who can make his way all around, or about a deaf-mute who had been taught to sing or speak. To find a man who can not read in the twentieth century and who is still intelligent and competent for citizenship and competent as a mold of the destinies of the American Republic is just as remarkable as any of these other remarkable things. These things do happen, but they do not happen very often.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have spoken twice before to the Senate on this subject, and I should hesitate, I realize, to speak again, but I wish to say we were not all blessed with living in affluence, with a wealthy father, and enabled to have the blessings of the higher education that my distinguished and lovable and genial friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] had. While he was basking in the universities of Germany some of the rest of us were earning bread and butter. So we are to be pardoned if we do not take exactly the same view he holds.

My friend the Senator just said that he wanted men in this country who were intellectually fit. Great God, our States' prisons are filled with men and women intellectually fit. Every

crook and vagabond could stand your literacy test and your best examination. I do not think that proves anything at all.

I sat here and listened to the eloquent tongue of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. He talked about the horde as the scum of the earth. We have been receiving immigrants for many years in this country, and we have had so small a percentage of what we could term horde and scum that it is infinitesimal. It comes with ill grace for a Senator in this free, democratic land, that hangs out the latchstring to the down-trodden and oppressed of all the world, to talk about horde and scum. Thank God, my grandfather came from France and my mother, who bore me, came directly from Germany. Mayhap they would not have been able to pass your test, and I defy such an insinuation as contemptible, un-American; yes, worse.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly. I talk earnestly, but you know I love you all.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator, of course, understood that I referred to certain people who deserve that appellation from their sworn evidence. I referred to them generally.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is no apology at all.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know the Senator did not mean to apply it to me at all.

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly I did not.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to say something about the voting test. The alien has to live here for some time before he can have granted to him the privilege of a vote. So he will have realized and learned something of the blessings that come from this free land and then is better able to exercise the privilege of voting.

But here you would bar a man or woman because of their misfortune that they could not read. As I said a day or two ago, it is unholy in that it does not treat mankind as brother. It is unjust in that you deny mankind equal privileges. I would bar the infirm, I would bar those who are unclean; but with moral minds, clean bodies, I would open the door and let our public-school system assimilate and adjust them.

I heard a list of percentages in the various States given. As I ran down the gamut I found that New Jersey had 26 per cent foreign born, and 14 per cent, I think, of that 26 per cent were illiterate. Yet we are not here asking your favor to put up the bars. New Jersey, glorious and proud in her recent history, proud in her Revolutionary history, and proud in her position to-day, asks no odds or favor of Georgia or of any other Commonwealth.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Senator speak for both Senators from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am speaking for myself, and I speak in part for New Jersey. I say that New Jersey has 26 per cent, and yet with this unholy horror in New Jersey we have multiplied in wealth in an appalling degree. It would stagger you Georgians to realize it. In building of public institutions, in mills and workshops, in banks and happy homes and general prosperity we can pass with any Commonwealth in this Union. I have wandered across the plains of Georgia, and I have seen her hills and dales and hollows. That part of the country the God of humanity has blessed beyond parallel. Look at the plains in Georgia, in Mississippi, and in South Carolina, and then look at those in New Jersey and see how richly blessed are the latter. They are what yours might be if the same class of immigrants should settle within your domain as have settled in the Commonwealth of New Jersey. Our dunes, that for years were drifted sand, are occupied by great colonies of Italians and Germans and Jews, who have cultivated the soil until to-day they are dotted with happy homes and are the picture of thrift and of industry.

When the story is told here of Italians coming to this land and earning a few dollars and then departing, I say God speed them. I do not envy, nor does the Senator in his own heart, any poor Italian who has gathered together through dint of perseverance and frugality and honesty a few hundred or mayhap a thousand dollars. I have seen hundreds of them coming to my Commonwealth and to the great city of New York who, through perseverance and accumulation, have gathered together a little fortune, and God knows I do not envy them. I have seen them delve 12 and 15 feet in sewers and in the great sub-

ways and in caissons for the foundations of great bridges that span our rivers. I have seen them taking their lives in their hands, working in a stifling atmosphere where it was almost impossible to exist and in conditions too horrifying to contemplate. They have earned a dollar and a half, mayhap, sometimes \$1.60 a day. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] told us yesterday that they average a wage of \$1.25. I say the man would be un-American and inhuman who would be jealous or envious of these poor fellows who may have carried their little money away that they have gathered together.

This stamp of illiteracy is akin to the old talk of property qualification. They are twin brothers; they go hand in hand. In many States the property qualification formerly existed. I believe it is only very recently that the last one—Rhode Island—abolished the property qualification. Only two or three days ago Louis Windmuller died. Everybody in our part of the country knew of him, and he was known generally throughout the country. He came to this land from Germany. He had but a dollar. It is not said that he was illiterate, but it is probable that he would not have passed the qualifications that are required by the bill. He became the most respected and honored citizen in New York. He gathered together great wealth and died with a fortune of nearly \$700,000. He grew to be quite cultured in matters of public debate and questions relating to the general welfare in the civic community. He was an honored citizen and a blessed and a most sterling monument to his race and to his adopted American citizenship.

I say that this qualification and the property qualification are both in keeping, one with the other. They are of the same kind and breed, of the same fold.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] found great delight a day or two ago when I was making some remarks on this subject, as to which I feel keenly. He said it was enfantillage—he called it "sentimentalism." Yes, thank God, I am full of sentimentalism; I am full of sentiment. I would not take it out if I could, and I could not if I would. Sentiment to humanity is what the blossom is to the vine. The Senator, too, is brimful of sentiment when it suits his line of argument; but when it does not, he turns his back on it in disgust and would ridicule it. Oh, yes; you can not take it out of me. My sentiment is love of my country. I love its institutions and I will do all I can to advance its welfare.

I want to vote for an immigration bill, but I want an immigration bill that shall have in its requirements cleanly bodies, moral minds, industrious and holy purposes. Beyond that I care not. I will leave the great public school institutions to assimilate those men and to infuse red blood into the veins of many who, God knows, need it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], but I think that one of the corrections that he made in the interest of historical accuracy was aimed at what he thought I had said. I think the Senator from Mississippi understood me to say that Thomas A. Edison was of foreign birth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I understood the Senator to say, at the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey, that he was a German.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I beg the Senator's pardon. I said that very many of his associates were Germans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh.

Mr. REED. This is what I said, and the Record will show it; the Senator from Mississippi simply did not hear correctly.

My attention has just been called by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] to the fact that many of those men who are now rendering great assistance to Thomas A. Edison in his wonderful inventions are Germans, who came here and secured employment with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Frankness compels me to say that I did not hear it that way. It is, of course, as the Senator states it. I remember distinctly the Senator from New Jersey said something to him about Edison being a German, or something of that sort, and I shook my head at the Senator from Missouri to keep him from making the mistake; and I understood him to go ahead and make it, anyway. It now seems that what the Senator from Missouri did say was something with which I have no sort of historical quarrel at all. It was the fault of my right ear, Mr. President, which happens to be my wrong ear. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator for keeping watch and ward, but even in this instance he did not hear correctly. I trust he will continue to supervise my conduct so that I shall be kept free from mistakes in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I can not undertake that charge. The proposed task is too great for me. [Laughter.] That reminds me a good deal, if I were to accept that charge, of

the prayer that Parson Brownlow delivered in Greeneville, Tenn.—

Mr. REED. If I might interrupt the anecdote, if it is a task that the Senator from Mississippi recognizes as beyond his ability, it is the first time I have ever seen him in that situation. I am glad that my ignorance and incapacity are so great that they have arrested the Senator and caused him to conclude there is something he can not quite correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, you and the Senate may think that the Senator from Missouri intended that last remark seriously on its own account, but the Senator did not. He merely intended to keep me from telling the anecdote which I was about to tell; that was all. [Laughter.] The Senator is one of the most malicious men, when he does become malicious, that I have ever known; and the most malicious thing in the world that a man can do is to interrupt another man just in the initial proceeding of telling an anecdote.

I was about to say that if I undertook to correct all the errors made by the Senator from Missouri, especially his political errors during some recent times, I might have before me a task similar to that suggested by this story, which Senators may apply for themselves.

It is said that Parson Brownlow, being entertained at one time at the house of old Dr. Sandy Williams, in the neighborhood of Greeneville, Tenn., and being a man "powerful in prayer," was called upon by Dr. Sandy late at night to lead in prayer before the gentlemen took their last nightcap and went to sleep, and Parson Brownlow arose and prayed. He prayed for men of all sorts and conditions; he prayed for the ignorant and the learned; for the wise and the unwise; for the rich and the poor; for the white and the black; and Parson Brownlow, being an old-line Whig, Dr. Sandy Williams being one, and a very distinguished but recently defeated Whig candidate for governor, Meredith P. Gentry, being present, and having recently been defeated by Andrew Johnson for that great office in the State of Tennessee, and having after that time suffered the death of his wife, and in consequence both of his defeat and the death of his wife having gone into a sort of a decline, and the party having been given for the purpose of making him forget his woes, this distinguished man was there, too, and was kneeling by the sofa. As Parson Brownlow's prayer became more and more affecting and more and more pathetic there could be heard audible sobs coming from the sofa, until finally Brownlow, thinking he would go even further, said: "And I pray Thee, O Lord, if in Thy infinite wisdom it be possible, for mercy, too, upon John M. Savage"—who was at that time the chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the State of Tennessee—"and upon Andrew Johnson—even upon them." About that time this distinguished statesman who had been very much affected, even to tears, rose and said: "Parson, stop right there. Do not ask too much. You will exhaust the fount of infinite mercy." [Laughter.]

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I should like to ask the Chair if that is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, while I favor the literacy provision of the immigration bill for reasons which I may very briefly state at a future stage of the discussion on the bill, I also favor the amendment now pending because of my unwillingness to debar from this country any who seek it as an asylum from either religious or political persecution. I have some misgivings that the privilege thus given, if it is given, may to some extent be abused; but I would rather that some did abuse it than to debar all.

I understand that this amendment is principally intended for the benefit of the Jews who live in certain countries in Europe, and I shall vote for the amendment with that understanding. I do not see any reason for the insertion of the word "racial" in the amendment, believing that the words "religious or political persecution" are sufficiently comprehensive to fully cover the case, yet I see no particular objection to the insertion of the word "racial."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado as modified.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood in voting on this proposed amendment that the very object of the literacy test will be nullified if the amendment is adopted. At another time I have explained fully why the committee saw fit to repeat what previous committees

have done by inserting the word "solely" before the words "religious persecution," and I hope it will be thoroughly understood that to introduce the words "political and racial" will practically nullify the object sought to be attained. In my judgment, to strike out the word "solely" and insert the words "political and racial" will be equivalent to inviting the whole world in, and will nullify the literacy test. With that explanation, I am ready to go to a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Question!

Mr. REED. Mr. President I ask that the amendment as modified be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. In section 3, page 9, beginning in line 6, it is proposed to strike out:

That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they emigrated from the country of which they were last permanent residents solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the following classes of persons, when otherwise qualified for admission under the laws of the United States, shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious, political, or racial persecution, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by discriminatory laws or regulations.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to say just a word or two. In the first place, the matter to which I shall direct the attention of the Senate may be considered somewhat technical, although I think it should be corrected. The amendment as it reads now provides that the immigrants shall prove that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution, and so forth. That is going to force the immigrant into statements oftentimes that may not be strictly correct. He is coming from the country of which he was last a resident because of religious or political persecution. He could go to Canada, to England, to France, to Germany, or to other countries so far as escaping persecution is concerned. He leaves to escape that, and comes here, of course, because of all the asylums to which he may flee he prefers this country. It seems to me that that language should be corrected.

While I am on my feet I want to say a word in regard to this amendment. I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the question of literacy as a test for admission to this country. It is a test according to the conditions under which a man has grown up. It may well be said that a man who grows to manhood in this country, with all the opportunities for education it affords, and is illiterate, lacks that spirit, that sentiment, and that temperament that will bring him best in harmony with the spirit of our institutions; but to say of the man who has had no opportunity to acquire an education that the lack of that education is evidence of his wanting in those things which would bring him in harmony with the spirit of our institutions is not accurate or fair.

I am not going to say anything concerning those immigrants who have come to this country. We have grown great under the system that we have pursued. Nor am I going to take the time of the Senate to discuss the people to whom this particular amendment is held out as a hope. Their history spells tragedy. More than that, we should remember that, either under a Divine purpose or under laws established, while their history spells tragedy to themselves it has spelled tragedy to their oppressors, because they have lived to see the downfall and the passing away of almost every race which ever oppressed them.

They come to this country and they make good citizens. They seldom appear at the almshouse and seldom appear in a court of justice in response to a criminal prosecution. They come from countries where they have not had an opportunity to secure an education. Now it is urged that we must change our policy and no longer admit that our country shall be an asylum; that we shall regulate our immigration laws without any regard to the principle of asylum; but, Mr. President, this bill in the very form it passed the House and in the form in which it is reported to the Senate by the committee concedes the principle of asylum on our shores to the oppressed. If this exception to the literacy clause means anything, if it is any more than an empty hope held out to oppressed people, it means that in their case, where they do flee from oppression, we recognize the asylum principle regardless of the literacy test. So we have the verdict of the House and we have the verdict of the Senate committee that we should recognize the principle of asylum within certain degrees.

The Senator from Mississippi, who has spoken so strongly against the thought of asylum, has offered an amendment here that carries the spirit of asylum in its very terms, because he proposes to make an exception to this rule further to those people who, because of the military occupation of their country by a foreign power, no longer live under the Government under which they formerly lived. Without regard to literacy they are to be admitted here. There is the admission that we still retain, and that, born of an instinct of justice and humanity, we ought to retain, the spirit and sentiment of asylum in our immigration laws.

I am in favor of the amendment, because ever since it has been my privilege to sit in this Chamber I have believed in one thing, and have been consistent in my belief and in my practice. I believe that when we pass legislation we should make legislation plain, so that it can be understood, so that it can be interpreted, and so that there will be the least possible difference of opinion as to its meaning and its interpretation. If it is the sentiment of the House, if it is the sentiment of the Senate committee, that we should recognize the principle of asylum in our immigration laws to the extent of admitting those who flee from religious persecution, we should recognize that in the policy of foreign Governments it is almost impossible to distinguish between that which comes from religious or political or racial persecution. We can not say of the unfortunate Jews in foreign countries whether it is religious, whether it is political, or whether it is racial; but we pretend here to hold out to these oppressed people the hope that in their oppression is to be found an exception to our literacy test and a recognition that somewhere, under certain limitations, we recognize the principle of asylum in our immigration laws.

That being true, Mr. President, we should hold out to them no false hopes. We should pass no law here that will simply lead to confusion in interpretation and in distinguishing what is meant and intended by the law. Then let us be plain and fair. Let us act aboveboard in this matter. We have back of us at this moment the action of the House and the Senate committee in recognizing that we should somewhere permit the asylum principle in our immigration laws. It is plain from the language of the bill that this hope is held out to a particular race. Then let us make it plain. Let us be fair and candid, and leave no ground for discussion or difference of opinion as to what the provision means. Recognizing that the oppression of the Jewish people in these foreign countries is born of an intermingling of religious, racial, and political motives and purposes, let us include all three in the exception in order that we may not hold out to them simply an empty hope.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. WORKS. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that the difficulty about this amendment is that it is not dependent upon the fact that these people are persecuted, but upon a mere statement made by them to that effect; and it will be a very easy matter for these illiterate people from all sections of the world to come in upon a mere statement of that kind when it is perfectly well known that there is no such persecution in the country from which they come. I think it should depend upon the existence of the fact that the Senator is talking about and not upon a mere statement by the party who is seeking to come in.

Mr. CLAPP. Why, Mr. President, that goes to the mechanism of this bill. The bill provides that they shall prove, to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officers, the existence of these facts. If the bill does not make abundant provision for that proof, that is another question and a separate question for discussion and dealing. That goes, as I say, to the mechanism. I am discussing now the exception itself. As these three conditions—religious, political, and racial—are so interwoven, I believe we should make this language plain and put it beyond controversy, and include the three terms in the exception, so that when the Jew fleeing from oppression abroad comes to these shores he will not be confronted with any effort at technical distinction between religious, racial, and political oppression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Hardwick	Page	Swanson
Burton	Hughes	Reed	Thomas
Clapp	Kern	Sheppard	Thornton
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Simmons	White
Cummins	Lewis	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gallinger	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Works
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. THORNTON. I have been requested to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on public business, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. BRADY. I desire to state that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is absent on official duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary proceeded to call the names of absent Senators.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m., Wednesday, December 30, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 31, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 30, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for our Republic and all its sacred institutions, for its national integrity and unity, and we most fervently pray for all who are called to minister to its genius that they may be inspired by the highest, purest, and most patriotic motives, that it may continue to grow in its intellectual, moral, and spiritual life to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discharged from the consideration of the following bills, and that they be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. My opinion is that they should go to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Bill S. 6782, to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed, in my opinion, belongs to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as it relates to the navigation laws, and all bills of that character, since I have been a member of the committee, have been referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 6781, to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, is an amendment to the Steamboat-Inspection Service law.

H. R. 20281, to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed. That is a companion bill to the bill S. 6782.

Also the bill H. R. 20282, to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that these bills be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged and that these bills be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Is there objection?